Robust change-point detection in panel data

Alexander Dürre[a,*], Roland Fried[a]

[a] *Fakultät Statistik, Technische Universität Dortmund, 44221 Dortmund, Germany*

arXiv:1611.02571v1 [math.ST] 8 Nov 2016

Abstract

In panel data we observe a usually high number N of individuals over a time period T. Even if T is large one often assumes stability of the model over time. We propose a nonparametric and robust test for a change in location and derive its asymptotic distribution under short range dependence and for $N, T \to \infty$. Some simulations show its usefulness under heavy tailed distributions.

Keywords: panel data, change-point test, M-estimation
2010 MSC: 62G35, 62G20, 62M10

1. Introduction

There is an increasing amount of literature on panel data taking structural breaks into account, see for example Im et al. (2005), Bai and Carrion-I-Silvestre (2009), Karavias and Tzavalis (2012) and Baltagi et al. (2013). Often the work of Joseph and Wolfson (1992) is regarded as starting point of change point detection in panel data. Therein two different change point models are introduced, namely the common change point model, where the time of change $\theta_i \in \{1, \dots, T\}$ is identical for every individual $i = 1, \dots, N$, and the random change point model, where θ_i is independent and identically distributed following an unknown distribution P_θ. Recent work mostly considers the first approach. Joseph and Wolfson (1992), De Wachter and Tzavalis (2005), De Wachter and Tzavalis (2012) and Baltagi et al. (2015) consider homogeneous panels, where either the dependence structure or the noise distribution is the same for all individuals, whereas Bai (2010) and Kim (2011) look also at heterogeneous ones.
Surprisingly little attention has been paid to robust procedures. To the best of our knowledge, the only exception is the article of Joseph and Wolfson (1992) where a robust variation of their original test procedure, a kind of Mann-Whitney-Wilcoxon test, is proposed. The lack of robust methods is in contrast to change point detection in one-dimensional (see for example Csörgo and Horváth (1987), Hušková (1996) and Dehling et al. (2015a)) or multi-dimensional time series (see Koziol (1978), Quessy et al. (2013) and Vogel and Fried (2015)). In these settings robust procedures are not only more reliable in case of some corrupted observations, but they also turn out to be more powerful under heavy tailed distributions (see Dehling et al. (2012) or Dehling et al. (2015b)).
In our article we propose a robust test for the fundamental problem of a common change point in location. As opposed to Joseph and Wolfson (1992) our test can cope with heterogeneous panels and short range dependence. Like Bai (2010), Horváth and Hušková (2012) and Jirak et al. (2015) we consider the case where both the time dimension T and the cross-sectional dimension N tends to infinity. But in contrast to them, by choosing a bounded ψ-function, moment assumptions are not required. Our test is based on M estimation and can be seen as a generalization of the test proposed in Horváth and Hušková (2012).

*corresponding author: alexander.duerre@udo.edu, +49-231-755-4288

This paper is structured as follows: in the next section we define the test statistic and explain how to choose the required tuning parameters. We present theoretical properties and conditions in Section 3. Section 4 contains a small simulation study showing the usefulness of the procedure and its finite sample performance. All proofs are deferred to an appendix.

2. Testing procedure

Let $(X_{i,t})_{i\in\{1,\dots,N\},\ t\in\{1,\dots,T\}}$ denote a panel where N is the number of individuals, which are observed at T equidistant time points. We assume the simple structure

$$X_{i,t} = \eta_i + \epsilon_{i,t}, \quad i = 1,\dots,N,\ t = 1,\dots,T,$$

implying that the outcome only depends on an individual location η_i and a random error $\epsilon_{i,t}$. We assume that the individual error processes $(\epsilon_{i,t})_{t=1,\dots,T},\ i = 1,\dots,N$ are (under the null hypothesis) stationary and independent of each other. They are allowed to have different distributions and to be short range dependent. For technical assumptions on $(\epsilon_i, t)_{i\in\{1,\dots,N\},\ t\in\{1,\dots,T\}}$ see Section 3. To avoid identification problems we set $\text{median}(\epsilon_{i,1}) = 0,\ i = 1,\dots,N$.
To detect changes in the one dimensional setting ($N = 1$) one often looks at the CUSUM statistic

$$Z_T^{(i)}(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}\nu_i}\left(\sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor Tx\rfloor} X_{i,t} - \frac{\lfloor Tx\rfloor}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} X_{i,t}\right), \quad x\in[0,1],$$

which basically compares the mean value of the first part with that of the second for every split point. A large difference indicates a change point. Therein,

$$\nu_i = Var(X_{i,1}) + 2\sum_{h=1}^{\infty}\text{Cov}(X_{i,1}, X_{i,1+h})$$

is the so called long run variance.
Since the CUSUM statistic is linear it is sensitive regarding unusually small or large values. To bound the influence of outliers one can transform the observations with a so called $\Psi-$function

$$Y_{i,t} = \Psi_i\left(\frac{X_{i,t}-\mu_i}{\sigma_i}\right), \quad i = 1,\dots,N,\ t = 1,\dots,T$$

with $\Psi_i : \mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R},\ \mu_i\in\mathbb{R},\ \sigma_i > 0,\ i = 1,\dots,N$. Two examples and their impact on a short time series are shown in Figure 1. In change-point analysis monotone $\Psi-$functions are preferred (Hušková and Marušiaková, 2012). The reason is that redescending ones not only limit the influence of unusual values, which can be a result of a large level shift, but also can shrink them to 0 as we can can see in Figure 1 on the right.



Figure 1: Ψ-functions (left) and corresponding transformed time series (right) with a level shift at $t = 11$.

Usually the parameters $\mu_i,\ i = 1, \ldots, N$ describe the central location and $\sigma_i,\ i = 1, \ldots, N$ the scale. Their aim is to standardize the data such that outliers are treated independently of the scale and location of the underlying distribution. Regarding the change-point problem they can also be seen as tuning parameters, since the resulting test is valid under some restrictions we will state in Section 3 irrespective of their particular choice. But of course some choices are more suitable than others. If σ_i is too large, outliers are hardly downweighted, and if it is too small, a lot of information is lost, see Figure 2. An inappropriate value of μ_i can heavily skew formerly symmetric data and even destroy the data completely, if μ_i is far away from the observed data, see Figure 2 on the right. We will show in Section 3 that under some regularity conditions we can choose μ_i and $\sigma_i,\ i = 1, \ldots, N$ data adaptively. We recommend to use highly robust and computationally fast estimators for location respectively scale, like the median and the median absolute deviation (MAD).



Figure 2: Transformed time series using the identity (solid), Huber (dashed) and bisquare (dotted) $\Psi-$ function with $\mu = 0,\ \sigma = 10$ (left), $\mu = 0,\ \sigma = 0.1$ (middle) and $\mu = 4,\ \sigma = 1$ (right).

Now one can define the CUSUM statistic of the transformed panel

$$S_T^{(i)}(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}v_i}\left(\sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor Tx\rfloor} Y_{i,t} - \frac{\lfloor Tx\rfloor}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} Y_{i,t}\right), \quad x \in [0,1]$$

with

$$v_i = Var(Y_{i,1}) + 2\sum_{h=1}^{\infty}\mathrm{Cov}(Y_{i,1}, Y_{i,1+h}).$$

In the one dimensional case $N = 1$, setting $\sigma_1 = 1$ and choosing μ_1 as the M-estimator corresponding to Ψ_1 this statistic was proposed by Hušková and Marušiaková (2012) for change point detection.
Assuming independence between the individuals the related multivariate Wald-type test for finite N equals

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(S_T^{(i)}(x)\right)^2, \quad x \in [0,1], \tag{1}$$

which converges for $T \to \infty$ under some regularity conditions to the sum of independent squared Brownian bridges. If additionally $N \to \infty$ one has to normalize (1):

$$W_{N,T}(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(\left(S_T^{(i)}(x)\right)^2 - \frac{\lfloor xT\rfloor(T-\lfloor xT\rfloor)}{T^2}\right), \quad x \in [0,1].$$

Note that $\frac{\lfloor xT\rfloor(T-\lfloor xT\rfloor)}{T^2}$ nearly equals the variance of a Brownian bridge and therefore approximates the mean of $S_T^{(i)}(x)$ for large T. Setting $\Psi_i(x) = x,\ i = 1,\ldots,N,\ \mu_i$ cancels out, σ_i is absorbed into v_i and one arrives at the non-robust panel-cusum-statistic which was originally proposed by Bai (2010) and investigated theoretically by Horváth and Hušková (2012). If T tends faster to infinity than N (the accurate rates can be found in Section 3) and under some regularity conditions $W_{N,T}(x)$ converges weakly to a Gaussian process $\Gamma(x)$ defined by

$$\mathbb{E}(\Gamma(x)) = 0 \ \text{ and } \ \mathrm{Cov}(\Gamma(x),\Gamma(y)) = x^2(1-y^2),\ 0 \le x \le y \le 1.$$

It is shown in Horváth and Hušková (2012) that such a process can be simulated based on a standard Brownian motion $(B(t))_{0\le t<\infty}$ using the following relationship:

$$\{\Gamma(x),\ 0 \le x \le 1\} \overset{D}{=} \left\{\sqrt{2}(1-x)^2 B\left(\frac{x^2}{1-x^2}\right),\ 0 \le x \le 1\right\}.$$

One rejects the null hypothesis of a stationary panel if

$$\sup_{0<x<1}|W_{N,T}(x)| \tag{2}$$

exceeds a certain quantile of $\sup_{0<x<1}|\Gamma(x)|$. A small selection of critical values can be found in Table 1.

α	0.9	0.95	0.975	0.99	0.995
q_α	0.899	0.990	1.072	1.173	1.245

Table 1: Quantiles of $\sup_{0<x<1}|\Gamma(x)|$.

The proposed test statistic (2) has the largest power if the change occurs in the middle of the sample. If one needs a high power near the margins, one can look at other functionals of $W_{N,T}(x)$, for example $\int_0^1 |W_{N,T}(x)|\, dx$.
In practice $v_i,\ i = 1, \ldots, N$, is unknown and has to be estimated. We propose to use a kernel estimator. Denote by

$$\hat{\gamma}_i(h) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{N-h} \left(Y_{i,t} - \overline{Y}_i\right) \left(Y_{i,t+h} - \overline{Y}_i\right)$$

with $\overline{Y}_i = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} Y_{i,t}$ the empirical autocovariance of $(Y_{i,t})_{t=1,\ldots,T}$ of lag $h,\ h = 1, \ldots, T-1$. Let furthermore $k : \mathbb{R} \to [-1, 1]$ be a kernel function and b_T a bandwidth, then

$$\hat{v}_i = \hat{\gamma}_{i,0} + 2 \sum_{i=0}^{b_{i,T}} \hat{\gamma}_{i,h} k\left(\frac{h}{b_T}\right) \tag{3}$$

is the related kernel estimator for v_i. Theoretical conditions on k and b_T can be found in the next section. Simulations in Section 4 indicate that the flat top kernel $k = k_F$

$$k_F(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & |x| \leq 0.5 \\ 2 - 2|x| & 0.5 < |x| \leq 1 \\ 0 & |x| > 1 \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

with $b_T = 2T^{0.4}$ works well if the serial dependence is not very large.

3. Theoretical results

In this section we give theoretical justification of the testing procedure and compile all conditions which are necessary for the asymptotical results. We start by defining the type of short range dependence we impose on the error processes $(\epsilon_{i,t})_{t=1,\ldots,T},\ i = 1, \ldots, N$. We assume that they are near epoch dependent in probability (P-NED) on an absolutely regular process.

Definition 1. *i) Let $A, B \subset F$ be two $\sigma-$fields on the probability space (Ω, F, P). Then the regularity coefficient of A and B is defined as*

$$\beta(A, B) = \mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{M \in A} |P(M|B) - P(M)|\right).$$

ii) For a stationary process $(Z_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$, the absolute regularity coefficients are given by

$$\beta_k = \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \beta(F_1^n, F_{n+k}^\infty),$$

where $F_n^k = \sigma(Z_n, \ldots, Z_k)$ denotes the $\sigma-$field generated by $\{\{Z_n\}, \ldots, \{Z_k\}\}$. A process is called absolutely regular, if $\beta(h) \to 0$.

iii) The process $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}$ is P-NED on the absolutely regular process $(Z_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$, if there is a sequence of approximating constants $(a_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ fulfilling $a_k \to 0$ for $k \to \infty$, a sequence of functions $f_k : \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and a decreasing function $\Phi :\ (0, \infty) \to (0, \infty)$ such that

$$P(|X_0 - f_k(Z_{-k}, \ldots, Z_k)| > \epsilon) \leq a_k \Phi(\epsilon) \tag{5}$$

Remark 1.

- *Looking at functionals of processes is quite natural, in fact ARMA and GARCH models are defined as functionals of iid sequences. Part iii) demands that the influence of observations of the underlying process $(Z_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$, corresponding to time points far away from the observed X_t, is small and even vanishes, if the time difference between them tends to infinity.*
- *The underlying process $(Z_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is sometimes assumed to be iid, see for example Hörmann (2008) and Aue et al. (2009), and though this class would yet be quite general, this assumption is in our case more restrictive than necessary. A main component of our proofs are moment inequalities, which works fine for absolutely regular processes (Philipp, 1986).*
- *The concept of near epoch dependence has a long history. It was introduced in Ibragimov (1962) where the difference between the approximating functional $f_k(Z_{-k},\dots,Z_k)$ and X_0 was measured by the L_2 norm, which requires existing second moments of $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}$. With applications under heavy tailed distributions and robustness in mind this is somehow restrictive, which was the reason Bierens (1981) proposed substituting the so called L_0 for the L_2 norm. We use here the variation presented by Dehling et al. (2012) which adds the error function Φ.*
- *Let Ψ be Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constant L, then it is easy to see that with $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}$ also $(\Psi(X_t))_{t\in\mathbb{N}}$ is P-NED on the same underlying process $(Z_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ with approximating functionals $\tilde{f}_k = \Psi(f_k(Z_{-k},\dots,Z_k))$ and constants $(a_k)_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$. For the error function corresponding to $(\Psi(X_t))_{t\in\mathbb{N}}$ we have $\tilde{\Phi}(x) = \Phi(x/L)$. Furthermore, if Ψ is bounded by a constant c: $\Phi(|2c+\epsilon|) = 0,\ \epsilon > 0$.*

Before stating our first result, we compile some assumptions on the errors $(\epsilon_{i,t})_{i=1,\dots,N,\ t=1,\dots,T}$, which we need repeatedly.

Assumption 1. *Let $(\epsilon_{i,t})_{t=1,\dots,T}$ be stationary processes, which are P-NED on absolutely regular processes $(Z_{t,i})_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ with approximating constants $(a_{k,i})_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$, regularity coefficients $(\beta_{k,i})_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ and error functions Φ_i for $i = 1,\dots,N$, which fulfil*

i) $(\epsilon_{1,t})_{t=1,\dots,T},\dots,(\epsilon_{N,t})_{t=1,\dots,T}$ are independent processes,

ii) either there exists c_1 such that $\forall i$:

$$|\Psi_i(\epsilon_{i,1})| < c_1$$

a.s. and

a) there exist $c_2 > 0$ such that for $\forall i$:

$$a_{k,i}, \beta_{k,i} \le c_2(1+k)^{-b}$$

for some $b > 8$

or there exist $c_1 > 0$ such that for $\forall i$:

$$\mathbb{E}\left(|\Psi_i(\epsilon_{i,1})|^a\right) < c_1$$

with $a \ge 8$ and

a) there exist $c_2 > 0$ such that for $\forall i$:

$$a_{k,i} \le c_2(1+k)^{-\frac{8\cdot a}{a-7}-\epsilon}$$

and

$$\beta_{k,i} \le c_2(1+k)^{-\frac{8\cdot a}{a-8}-\epsilon}$$

for some $\epsilon > 0$,

b) there exists Φ *with* $\Phi_i(x) \leq \Phi(x),\ x > 0$ *such that*

$$\int_0^\infty x^a \Phi(x)\ dx < \infty.$$

Remark 2.

- *Assumption i) is very strong but essential in the proof. Including dependence between panels is for this test statistic if at all only possible under very restrictive assumptions. For example Horváth and Hušková (2012) add dependence through common time effects, which need to shrink with increasing* N*. Another possibility could be to impose a spatial dependence structure like in Jirak et al. (2015).*

- *To get a robust test* Ψ_i *has to be bounded for* $i = 1, \ldots, N$*, so in this case* $|\Psi_i(\epsilon_{i,1})| < c_1$ *a.s is always fulfilled regardless of the underlying distribution. This is a major advantage of the robust method over the non-robust one which depends on finite moments of order 8, see also Horváth and Hušková (2012).*

- *If* $|\Psi_i(\epsilon_{i,1})|$ *is not bounded one needs at least finite eighth moments of the transformed time series. If higher moment exists, one can weaken the dependence condition a). Assumption b) is quite technical and can be reformulated using the* L_a *norm. Using the P-NED concept is quite artificial in this case. Nevertheless we will prove the results also under these assumptions since it generalizes the results of Horváth and Hušková (2012) to non-linear processes.*

- *Assumption a) defines that the dependence needs to decay uniformly. A similar condition can also be found in Horváth and Hušková (2012).*

In the following theorem we derive the asymptotic behaviour of $W_{N,T}(x)$ if v_i is known and σ_i, μ_i are fixed for $i = 1, \ldots, N$. Let for this purpose $\overset{D[0,1]}{\to}$ denote weak convergence in the Skorokhod space $D[0,1]$.

Theorem 1. *Let* $(\epsilon_{i,t})_{i=1,\ldots,N,\ t=1,\ldots,T}$ *fulfil assumption 1 and furthermore*

i) $N, T \to \infty$ *with* $N/T^2 \to 0$

ii) the $\Psi-$*functions are Lipschitz continuous with constants* L_i *which are bounded by* L*,*

iii) there exists δ *such that*

$$\inf_{i \in \mathbb{N}} v_i \geq \delta,$$

iv) there exists σ_0 *such that*

$$\inf_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \sigma_i \geq \sigma_0,$$

then

$$(W_N, T(x))_{x \in [0,1]} \overset{D[0,1]}{\to} (\Gamma(x))_{x \in [0,1]} \text{ weakly.}$$

Remark 3. *i) The special case* $\Psi_i(x) = x$ *is treated by Horváth and Hušková (2012). Note that the functions* $(\Psi_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ *do not interfere with the limiting distribution as long as they do not cut existing moments.*

ii) Condition i) permits N to grow somewhat faster than T. Intuitively one might think that a large N always improves the asymptotics, but one needs to remember that the standardization by $\frac{\lfloor xT\rfloor(T-\lfloor xT\rfloor)}{T^2}$ and v_i is only an approximation for large T. If N grows too fast these small errors sum up to something which is not negligible. The same ratio is also required in Horváth and Hušková (2012).

iii) Assumption ii) implies some regularity conditions for the ψ-functions. Similar conditions can be found in one dimensional change point detection, see Hušková and Marušiaková (2012). For usual ψ functions this is no restriction.

iv) Condition iii) states that the variability within one individual should not tend to 0 and this condition can also be found in Horváth and Hušková (2012). Though one has to mention that the condition is here formulated based on the transformed time series. Inappropriate choices of μ_i and σ_i can shrink all values to a constant, see Figure 2, and so cause the assumption to be violated, though the original time series was permissible.

To actually apply the testing procedure, one has to find estimators for $v_i,\ i = 1, \dots, N$. As usual the asymptotics depend on the smoothness of the kernel k in 0. We need the following assumptions on the kernel.

Assumption 2. *Let $k : \mathbb{R} \to [-1, 1]$ be a kernel function with*

1. $k(0) = 0,\ k(x) = 0,\ |x| \geq 1,\ k(-x) = x,\ |x| < 1,$
2. *the first $m - 1 > 0$ derivatives of k in 0 are 0,*
3. $\exists \epsilon, M > 0$ *such that* $|k^{(m)}(x)| \leq M,\ |x| \leq \epsilon$, *where $k^{(m)}$ denotes the $m-$th derivative of k.*

The assumptions are satisfied by the popular Daniell, Blackman-Tukey, Hanning, Hamming and Parzen kernels with $m = 2$ and by the flat top kernel (4) for arbitrary $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Since the Bartlett-Kernel is not differentiable in 0, it is not covered by the assumptions.
Beneath the smoothness of the kernel, the rate of convergence depends on the strength of the serial dependence. Define therefore b as the maximal number such that in Assumption 1 ii) a)

$$a_k, \beta_k \leq c(1 + k)^{-b-\epsilon}$$

for the bounded case, respectively

$$a_{k,i}, \beta_{k,i} \leq c_2(1 + k)^{-b\frac{2\cdot a}{a-1}-\epsilon}$$

for some $\epsilon > 0$.
The next theorem deals with the case where the theoretical long run variances v_i are replaced by their kernel estimations (3).

Theorem 2. *Let*

$$\tilde{S}_T^{(i)}(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}\hat{v}_i}\left(\sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor Tx\rfloor} Y_{i,t} - \frac{\lfloor Tx\rfloor}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} Y_{i,t}\right), \quad x \in [0, 1],$$

denote the CUSUM-statistic with estimated long run variance using (3) and

$$\tilde{W}_{N,T}(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(\left(\tilde{S}_T^{(i)}(x)\right)^2 - \frac{\lfloor xT\rfloor(T - \lfloor xT\rfloor)}{T^2}\right), \quad x \in [0, 1].$$

the related panel-CUSUM-statistic. Let furthermore $(\epsilon_{i,t})_{i=1,\dots,N,\ =1,\dots,N}$ fulfil Assumption 1 and k Assumption 2. If furthermore

i) $N, T \to \infty$ *with* $Nb_T/T \to 0$, $N/b_T^s \to 0$, *where* $s = \min\{b-1, m\}$,

ii) the $\Psi-$*functions are Lipschitz continuous with constants* L_i *which are bounded by* L,

iii) there exists δ *such that*

$$\inf_{i\in\mathbb{N}} v_i \geq \delta,$$

iv) there exists σ_0 *such that*

$$\inf_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \sigma_i \geq \sigma_0,$$

holds, then

$$\sup_{x\in[0,1]} |\tilde{W}_{N,T}(x) - W_{N,T}(x)| \to 0.$$

Remark 4.

- *The assumption* $Nb_T/T \to 0$ *seems to be stronger than necessary. In the same situation Horváth and Hušková (2012) only require* $Nb_T^2/T^2 \to 0$. *The reason seems to be a difference in the proofs. While at one point Horváth and Hušková (2012) consider the* L_2 *norm, we choose the* L_1 *norm to make the proof somewhat more feasible. Remember that we allow for a little more complicated dependence structure.*

- *As usual for kernel estimators the rate of* b_T *should neither be too fast (large variance) nor too slow (large bias). This is reflected in assumption i). Furthermore, we see that from the theoretical point of view the flat-top kernel is preferable. In this case the bias condition* $N/b_T^s \to 0$ *only depends on the strength of the serial dependence.*

At last we want to prove that the tuning parameters μ_i and $\sigma_i,\ i = 1\ldots, N$ can be chosen data-adaptively. Remember that this is not necessary for the non robust test statistic, where one chooses the identity as $\Psi-$functions. We need the following assumptions on the $\Psi-$functions.

Assumption 3. *i)* Ψ_i *is* $m+1$ *times continuously differentiable with derivatives*

$$\Psi_i^{(1)}, \ldots, \Psi_i^{(m+1)},\ i = 1, \ldots, N.$$

ii) There exists c *such that*

$$|\Psi_i^k(x)x^k|_\infty < c,\ i = 1, \ldots, N,\ k = 1, \ldots, m+1.$$

Remark 5.

- *Assumption i) is often not fulfilled for standard* $\Psi-$*functions. The Huber* $\Psi-$*function is for example only continuous but in two points not differentiable. This assumption may be relaxed to the case where the function is differentiable in all but a finite number of points at least as the error distribution is continuous. This would be fulfilled for all common* $\Psi-$*functions. Nevertheless the current condition is not a restriction in practice, since one can always find* $m+1$*-times differentiable modifications which hardly differ from the original* $\Psi-$*function.*

- *Assumption ii) is no substantial restriction, since* $\Psi-$*functions are usually constant for large values (and so its derivatives are 0).*

Furthermore we also need conditions on the estimators for μ_i and $\sigma_i,\ i = 1, \ldots, N$.

Assumption 4. *Let* $(\mu_t^{(i)})_{t\in\mathbb{N}}$ *and* $(\sigma_t^{(i)})_{t\in\mathbb{N}}$ *be sequences of random variables which possibly depend on the observed* $(X_{i,t})_{t=1,\ldots,T}$. *Furthermore*

i) $\exists c_1, c_2, \alpha, \beta > 0$ *and* $\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_N \in \mathbb{R}$ *such that* $P(|\mu_t^{(i)} - \mu_i| > c_1 t^{-\beta}) \leq c_2 t^{-\alpha},\ t \in \mathbb{N},\ i = 1, \ldots, N$

ii) $\exists c_1, c_2, \alpha, \beta > 0$ *and* $\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_N \in \mathbb{R}$ *such that* $P(|\frac{1}{\sigma_t^{(i)}} - \frac{1}{\sigma_i}| > c_1 t^{-\beta}) \leq c_2 t^{-\alpha},\ t \in \mathbb{N},\ i = 1, \ldots, N$

Remark 6. *Under independence there exist exponential inequalities for the median and the MAD, see Serfling (1980). Under some additional regularity assumptions like a continuous distribution density which is bounded from above around the median for* $i = 1, \ldots, N$*, this implies that one can choose* $\beta = 1/2 - \epsilon$ *for some* $\epsilon > 0$ *and* $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ *arbitrarily large. We can not find such results under dependence, but looking at the proof in Serfling (1980) or Serfling and Mazumder (2009) it only depends on the existence of a Hoeffding inequality, which is proven under various dependence conditions, see Kontorovich and Ramanan (2008) or Kallabis et al. (2006). Proving such an inequality for the P-NED case is not the objective of this paper, but we want to emphasize that such conditions are not restrictive at all.*

Theorem 3. *Denote by*

$$\check{S}_T^{(i)}(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}\hat{v}_i} \left(\sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor Tx \rfloor} \Psi_i \left(\frac{X_{i,t} - \mu_T^{(i)}}{\sigma_T^{(i)}} \right) - \frac{\lfloor Tx \rfloor}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \Psi_i \left(\frac{X_{i,t} - \mu_T^{(i)}}{\sigma_T^{(i)}} \right) \right), \quad x \in [0,1]$$

the CUSUM-statistic with estimated long run variance and by

$$\check{W}_{N,T}(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left(\left(\check{S}_T^{(i)}(x) \right)^2 - \frac{\lfloor xT \rfloor (T - \lfloor xT \rfloor)}{T^2} \right), \quad x \in [0,1].$$

the related panel-CUSUM-statistic. Let $(\epsilon_{i,t})_{i=1,\ldots,N,\ t=1,\ldots,T}$ *fulfil Assumption 1, k Assumption 2 and* $(\Psi_i)_{i=1,\ldots,N}$ *Assumption 3. Let furthermore*

i) $N, T \to \infty$ *with* $Nb_T/T \to 0$*,* $N/b_T^s \to 0$*, where* $s = \min\{b-1, m\}$*,* $N/T^{2\beta} \to 0$*,* $N/T^{\alpha} \to 0$ *and* $N/T^{2(\beta(m+1)-1)} \to 0$*,*

ii) there exists δ *such that*

$$\inf_{i \in \mathbb{N}} v_i \geq \delta,$$

iii) there exists τ *such that*

$$\sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} v_i^{(k)} \leq \tau,$$

with $v_i^{(k)} = Var(\Psi(X_{i,1})^{(k)}) + 2\sum_{h=1}^{\infty} Cov(\Psi(X_{i,1})^{(k)}, \Psi(X_{i,1+h})^{(k)})$*,*

iv) there exists σ_0 *such that*

$$\inf_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \sigma_i \geq \sigma_0,$$

then

$$\sup_{x \in [0,1]} |\check{W}_{N,T}(x) - W_{N,T}(x)| \to 0.$$

Remark 7.

- *Additionally to the persisting conditions on the ratio of N and T, we get the assumptions $N/T^{2\beta} \to 0$, $N/T^{\alpha} \to 0$ and $N/T^{\beta(m+1)-1} \to 0$. If exponential inequalities for μ_i and σ_i, $i = 1, \ldots, N$ are available and Ψ_i is 2 times continuously differentiable, $i = 1, \ldots, N$ this boils down to $N/T^{1-\epsilon} \to 0$ for some $\epsilon \to 0$. So T has to grow a little faster than N.*
- *For robust $\Psi-$functions assumption iii) is no restriction since they are usually constant for large absolute values, consequently the derivatives are bounded and so are the variances.*

4. Simulation

In this section we want to evaluate our proposed test statistic concerning two aspects: The size under the null hypothesis and the power under the alternative. There are quite different simulation scenarios possible, since we allow for quite diverse serial dependence and distributions of the individuals. For better comparability we orientate ourselves at the AR(1) models considered in Horváth and Hušková (2012)

$$X_{i,t} = \rho \cdot X_{i,t-1} + a_{i,t},\ t = 1, \ldots, T,\ i = 1, \ldots, N.$$

We compare the non robust panel CUSUM statistic proposed by Horváth and Hušková (2012) with our robust alternative. We use a two times continuously differentiable version of Hubers-$\Psi-$function which is shown in Figure 3. Furthermore we choose the flat top kernel (4) with a bandwidth $b_T = 2T^{0.4}$ for both estimators. Note that Horváth and Hušková (2012) originally use a rather small value of b_T varying between 2.5 and 5 which is, however, not appropriate in our simulations where we also look at relatively large T. Simulation results are based on 1000 runs each.
We first look at finite sample properties under the null hypothesis. In the case of $\rho = 0$, where we have no serial dependence, both tests need at least $T = 200$ to work properly as one can see in Figure 2. Furthermore the simulations confirm the theoretical results that N must not grow much faster than T. We also notice that there is basically no difference between the tests under Gaussianity.



Figure 3: Two times continuously differentiable version of Hubers $\Psi-$function used in the simulations.

In case of a more heavy tailed distribution like a t-distribution with 4 degrees of freedom, results do not change much, as one can see in Figure 3. The non robust test seems to work well under the null hypothesis though its assumptions (finite 8-th moments) are violated.

	non-robust test					robust test				
N T	50	100	200	400	800	50	100	200	400	800
50	0.33	0.13	0.07	0.07	0.04	0.33	0.14	0.07	0.06	0.04
100	0.52	0.14	0.06	0.07	0.06	0.55	0.15	0.07	0.06	0.06
200	0.77	0.21	0.11	0.07	0.04	0.79	0.22	0.11	0.08	0.04
400	0.97	0.40	0.18	0.08	0.08	0.97	0.41	0.17	0.07	0.08
800	1.00	0.65	0.28	0.13	0.06	1.00	0.66	0.28	0.13	0.07

Table 2: Empirical size under $\rho = 0$, normal innovations and a significance level of 0.05.

	non-robust test					robust test				
N T	50	100	200	400	800	50	100	200	400	800
50	0.30	0.11	0.05	0.08	0.06	0.34	0.10	0.05	0.08	0.06
100	0.47	0.15	0.08	0.06	0.06	0.54	0.16	0.08	0.06	0.06
200	0.74	0.19	0.10	0.06	0.05	0.77	0.25	0.11	0.07	0.06
400	0.97	0.36	0.12	0.08	0.06	0.97	0.41	0.15	0.09	0.06
800	1.00	0.65	0.23	0.14	0.08	1.00	0.68	0.26	0.15	0.08

Table 3: Empirical size under $\rho = 0$, t_3 distributed innovations and a significance level of 0.05.

Somewhat surprisingly the results get better under serial correlation ($\rho = 0.5$) where we get reasonable empirical sizes already for $T = 100$. This can be partly explained by the relatively large bandwidth which better fits the case $\rho = 0.5$ than $\rho = 0$.

	non-robust test					robust test				
N T	50	100	200	400	800	50	100	200	400	800
50	0.07	0.06	0.05	0.04	0.03	0.08	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.03
100	0.12	0.07	0.04	0.04	0.05	0.12	0.07	0.04	0.04	0.06
200	0.24	0.10	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.26	0.11	0.05	0.05	0.04
400	0.53	0.16	0.07	0.06	0.04	0.54	0.17	0.07	0.05	0.04
800	0.90	0.36	0.13	0.07	0.05	0.90	0.37	0.13	0.07	0.05

Table 4: Empirical size under $\rho = 0.5$, normal innovations and a significance level of 0.05.

Now we want to turn our focus at the behaviour under the alternative. Therefore we choose $\rho = 0.25$, set $T = 400$, $N = 200$ and add a jump at $t = 200$. Its height is generated by a normal distribution with mean 0 and standard deviation Δ varying between 0 and 0.2. Results for normal innovations can be found in Figure 4. We see that there is also no visual difference between the tests under the alternative in case of normal data.



Figure 4: Empirical power under $\rho = 0.25$, standard normal innovations, $N = 200$, $T = 400$ and a jump at $T = 200$ which is generated by a normal distribution with mean 0 and standard deviation Δ.

This changes as the innovations get more heavy tailed. The robust test statistic performs superoir in case of t_5 distributed innovations, see Figure 5. This advantage increases if one looks at more heavy tailed distributions. Under t_1 innovations the power of the non robust test even does not exceed its size.



Figure 5: Empirical power under $\rho = 0.25$, t_5-distributed innovations, $N = 200$, $T = 400$ and a jump at $T = 200$ which is generated by a normal distribution with mean 0 and standard deviation Δ.

To sum up, the robust test performs comparably to the non robust one in the Gaussian case and clearly outperforms it under heavy tailed distributions.

References

T. W. Anderson. *The statistical analysis of time series.* John Wiley & Sons, 1971.

A. Aue, S. Hörmann, L. Horváth, and M. Reimherr. Break detection in the covariance structure of multivariate time series models. *The Annals of Statistics*, 37(6B):4046–4087, 2009.

J. Bai. Common breaks in means and variances for panel data. *Journal of Econometrics*, 157(1):78–92, 2010.
J. Bai and J. L. Carrion-I-Silvestre. Structural changes, common stochastic trends, and unit roots in panel data. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 76(2):471–501, 2009.
B. H. Baltagi, Q. Feng, C. Kao, et al. Estimation of heterogeneous panels with structural breaks. Technical report, Syracuse University, 2013.
B. H. Baltagi, C. Kao, and L. Liu. Estimation and identification of change points in panel models with nonstationary or stationary regressors and error term. 2015.
H. J. Bierens. *Robust methods and asymptotic theory in nonlinear econometrics*, volume 192. Springer, 1981.
P. Billingsley. *Convergence of probability measures*. John Wiley & Sons, 1968.
M. Csörgo and L. Horváth. Nonparametric tests for the changepoint problem. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 17:1–9, 1987.
S. De Wachter and E. Tzavalis. Monte carlo comparison of model and moment selection and classical inference approaches to break detection in panel data models. *Economics Letters*, 88(1):91–96, 2005.
S. De Wachter and E. Tzavalis. Detection of structural breaks in linear dynamic panel data models. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 56(11):3020–3034, 2012.
H. Dehling, D. Vogel, M. Wendler, and D. Wied. Testing for changes in the rank correlation of time series. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1203.4871*, 2012.
H. Dehling, R. Fried, I. Garcia, and M. Wendler. Change-point detection under dependence based on two-sample u-statistics. In *Asymptotic Laws and Methods in Stochastics*, pages 195–220. Springer, 2015a.
H. Dehling, R. Fried, and M. Wendler. A robust method for shift detection in time series. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1506.03345*, 2015b.
S. Hörmann. Augmented GARCH sequences: Dependence structure and asymptotics. *Bernoulli*, pages 543–561, 2008.
L. Horváth and M. Hušková. Change-point detection in panel data. *Journal of Time Series Analysis*, 33(4): 631–648, 2012.
M. Hušková. Tests and estimators for the change point problem based on M-statistics. *Statistics & Risk Modeling*, 14(2):115–136, 1996.
M. Hušková and M. Marušiaková. M-procedures for detection of changes for dependent observations. *Communications in Statistics-Simulation and Computation*, 41(7):1032–1050, 2012.
I. A. Ibragimov. Some limit theorems for stationary processes. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 7(4): 349–382, 1962.
K.-S. Im, J. Lee, and M. Tieslau. Panel lm unit-root tests with level shifts. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 67(3):393–419, 2005.
M. Jirak et al. Uniform change point tests in high dimension. *The Annals of Statistics*, 43(6):2451–2483, 2015.
L. Joseph and D. B. Wolfson. Estimation in multi-path change-point problems. *Communications in Statistics-Theory and Methods*, 21(4):897–913, 1992.
R. S. Kallabis, M. H. Neumann, et al. An exponential inequality under weak dependence. *Bernoulli*, 12(2): 333–350, 2006.
Y. Karavias and E. Tzavalis. Generalized fixed-T panel unit root tests allowing for structural breaks. *Discussion paper*, 2012.
D. Kim. Estimating a common deterministic time trend break in large panels with cross sectional dependence. *Journal of Econometrics*, 164(2):310–330, 2011.
L. A. Kontorovich and K. Ramanan. Concentration inequalities for dependent random variables via the martingale method. *The Annals of Probability*, 36(6):2126–2158, 2008.
J. A. Koziol. Multivariate signed rank statistics for shift alternatives. *Statistics: A Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 9(4):549–562, 1978.
M. M. Loeve. *Probability Theory: 2d Ed.* D. Van Nostrand, 1960.
W. Philipp. Invariance principles for independent and weakly dependent random variables. In *Dependence in Probability and Statistics (Proc. Conf. Oberwolfach. 1985). Boston*, pages 225–268, 1986.
J.-F. Quessy, M. Saïd, and A.-C. Favre. Multivariate Kendall's tau for change-point detection in copulas. *Canadian Journal of Statistics*, 41(1):65–82, 2013.
R. Serfling and S. Mazumder. Exponential probability inequality and convergence results for the median absolute deviation and its modifications. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 79(16):1767–1773, 2009.
R. J. Serfling. *Approximation theorems of mathematical statistics*. John Wiley & Sons, 1980.
D. Vogel and R. Fried. Robust change detection in the dependence structure of multivariate time series. In *Modern Nonparametric, Robust and Multivariate Methods*, pages 265–288. Springer, 2015.

Appendix A. Proofs

The main component of our proofs are moment inequalities, which are based on coupling arguments. More in detail we use the following result by Philipp (1986) which describes how

dependent random variables can be substituted by independent ones.

Proposition 1. *(Theorem 3.4 in Philipp (1986)): Let $\{B_k, m_k, k \geq 1\}$ be a sequence of Polish spaces. Let α_k denote the Borel field over B_k, let $\{X_k,\ k \geq 0\}$ be a sequence of random variables with values in B_k and let $\{\gamma_k,\ k \geq 0\}$ be a sequence of non-decreasing $\sigma-$fields such that X_k is γ_k-measurable. Suppose that for some sequence $\{\beta_k\ k \geq 0\}$ of non-negative numbers*

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{A \in \alpha_k} (|P(X_k \in A|\gamma_{k-1}) - P(X_k \in A)|) \leq \beta_k$$

for all $k \geq 1$. Denote by F_k the distribution of X_k and let $\{G_k,\ k \geq 0\}$ be a sequence of distributions on (B_k, α_k) such that

$$F_k(A) \leq G_k(A^{\rho_k}) + \sigma_k \ \ \forall\ A \in \alpha_k$$

with $\rho_k,\ \sigma_k \geq 0$ and $A^{\rho_k} = \cup_{x \in A}\{y :\ m_k(x,y) \leq \epsilon\}$. Then without changing its distribution, one can redefine the sequence $\{X_k,\ k \geq 0\}$ on a richer probability space on which there exists a sequence $\{Y_k,\ k \geq 1\}$ of independent random variables with distribution G_k such that for all $k \geq 1$:

$$P(m_k(X_k, Y_k) > \rho_k) \leq \beta_k + \sigma_k.$$

We use Proposition 1 to derive covariance inequalities for processes which are P-NED.

Proposition 2. *Let $(X_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ be stationary and P-NED on an absolutely regular process $(Z_t)_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ with approximation constants $(a_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, functionals $(f_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, error function Φ and absolutely regularity coefficients $(\beta_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$. There exists $a > p \geq 2$ with $\mathbb{E}(|X_1|^a) < \infty$, $\int_0^\infty x^{\frac{a}{a-p+1}} \Phi(x) dx < \infty$ and denote $1 \leq i_1 \leq \ldots \leq i_p \leq T$ indices with $i_{k+1} - i_k = m + 1$, then there exists D_1 and D_2 independent of m such that*

$$|\mathbb{E}(X_{i_1} \ldots X_{i_k} X_{i_{k+1}} \ldots X_{i_p}) - \mathbb{E}(X_{i_1} \ldots X_{i_k})\mathbb{E}(X_{i_{k+1}} \ldots X_{i_p})| \leq D_1 a_{\lfloor m/3 \rfloor}^{\frac{a-p+1}{a}} + D_2 \beta_{\lfloor m/3 \rfloor}^{\frac{a-p}{p}}.$$

Proof of Proposition 2. First we build independent blocks $\tilde{W}_1 = \tilde{Z}_{i_1 - \lfloor m/3 \rfloor}, \ldots, \tilde{Z}_{i_k + \lfloor m/3 \rfloor}$ and $\tilde{W}_2 = \tilde{Z}_{i_{k+1} - \lfloor m/3 \rfloor}, \ldots, \tilde{Z}_{i_p + \lfloor m/3 \rfloor}$ where the functionals f_m will work. Denote the original blocks by $W_1 = Z_{i_1 - \lfloor m/3 \rfloor}, \ldots, Z_{i_k + \lfloor m/3 \rfloor}$ and $W_2 = Z_{i_{k+1} - \lfloor m/3 \rfloor}, \ldots, Z_{i_p + \lfloor m/3 \rfloor}$ we apply Proposition 1 with $X_1 = W_1$ and $X_2 = W_2$ as well as $\rho_k = \sigma_k = 0$ for $k = 1, 2$. Then $B_1 = \mathbb{R}^{i_k - i_1 + 2\lfloor m/3 \rfloor}$ and $B_2 = \mathbb{R}^{i_p - i_{k+1} + 2\lfloor m/3 \rfloor}$ are polish spaces, γ_1 and γ_2 σ-algebras induced by $\{\ldots, Z_{i_k + \lfloor m/3 \rfloor}\}$ respectively $\{\ldots, Z_{i_p + \lfloor m/3 \rfloor})\}$ and

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{A \in \alpha_r} (|P(W_r \in A|\gamma_{r-1}) - P(W_r \in A)|) \leq \beta_{m - 2\lfloor m/3 \rfloor} \leq \beta_{\lfloor m/3 \rfloor}\ r = 1, 2$$

since both blocks are separated by $m - 2\lfloor m/3 \rfloor$. Proposition 1 then guarantees the existence of independent blocks $\tilde{W}_1$ and $\tilde{W}_2$ which are distributed as W_1 and W_2 such that:

$$P(\tilde{W}_i \neq W_i) \leq \beta_{\lfloor m/3 \rfloor} \text{ for } i = 1, 2$$

which entail that the corresponding functionals $f_{\lfloor m/3 \rfloor}(\tilde{W}_1) = \tilde{X}_1$ and $f_{\lfloor m/3 \rfloor}(\tilde{W}_2) = \tilde{X}_2$ are also independent. If $i_1 \leq l \leq i_k$ one gets the following decomposition of the error

$$\mathbb{E}(|X_l - \tilde{X}_l|^{\frac{a}{a-p+1}}) = \mathbb{E}(|(X_l - \tilde{X}_l) I_{W_1 = \tilde{W}_1}|^{\frac{a}{a-p+1}}) + \mathbb{E}(|(X_l - \tilde{X}_l) I_{W_1 \neq \tilde{W}_1}|^{\frac{a}{a-p+1}}). \tag{A.1}$$

For the first term one can use the P-NED property iii)

$$\mathbb{E}(|(X_l - \tilde{X}_l) I_{W_1 = \tilde{W}_1}|^{\frac{a}{a-p+1}}) \leq a_{\lfloor m/3 \rfloor} \int_0^\infty \epsilon^{\frac{a}{a-p+1}} \Phi(\epsilon) d\epsilon \leq a_{\lfloor m/3 \rfloor} \cdot C_1$$

where C_1 only depends on Φ. Using the c_r inequality (see Loeve, 1960, p. 157) and Hölder inequality we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}(|(X_l - \tilde{X}_l)I_{W_1 \neq \tilde{W}_1}|^{\frac{a}{a-p+1}}) \\
&\quad \leq 2^{\frac{a}{a-p+1}} \left(\mathbb{E}(|X_l I_{W_1 \neq \tilde{W}_1}|^{\frac{a}{a-p+1}}) + \mathbb{E}(|\tilde{X}_l I_{W_1 \neq \tilde{W}_1}|^{\frac{a}{a-p+1}}) \right) \\
&\quad \leq 2^{\frac{a}{a-p+1}} \left([\mathbb{E}(|X_l|^a)]^{\frac{1}{a-p+1}} P(W_1 \neq \tilde{W}_1)^{\frac{a-p}{a-p+1}} + [\mathbb{E}(|\tilde{X}_l|^a)]^{\frac{1}{a-p+1}} P(W_1 \neq \tilde{W}_1)^{\frac{a-p}{a-p+1}} \right). \\
&\quad \leq 2^{\frac{a}{a-p+1}} \beta_{\lfloor m/3 \rfloor}^{\frac{a-p}{a-p+1}} \left([\mathbb{E}(|X_l|^a)]^{\frac{1}{a-p+1}} + [\mathbb{E}(|\tilde{X}_l|^a)]^{\frac{1}{a-p+1}} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\tilde{W}_1$ is distributed as W_1 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(|\tilde{X}_1|^p) &= \mathbb{E}(|f_{\lfloor m/3 \rfloor}(W_1)|^a) \\
&\leq 2^{a-1}(\mathbb{E}(|f(W_1) - X_1|^a) + \mathbb{E}(|X_1|^a) \\
&\leq 2^{a-1}(a_{\lfloor m/3 \rfloor} C_1 + \mathbb{E}(|X_1|^a)).
\end{aligned}$$

and therefore (A.1) is bounded by

$$\mathbb{E}(|X_l - \tilde{X}_l|^{\frac{a}{a-p+1}}) \leq C_2(a_{\lfloor m/3 \rfloor} + \beta_{\lfloor m/3 \rfloor}^{\frac{a-p}{a-p+1}}) \tag{A.2}$$

which one also get for $i_{k+1} \leq l \leq i_p$. To derive covariance inequalities we need a bound for the error between products of random variables and its copies

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}(|X_{i_1} \dots X_{i_p} - \tilde{X}_{i_1} \dots \tilde{X}_{i_p}|) \\
&\quad \leq \mathbb{E}(|(X_{i_1} - \tilde{X}_{i_1})(X_{i_2} \dots X_{i_p})|) + \sum_{j=2}^{p-1} \mathbb{E}(|\tilde{X}_{i_1} \dots \tilde{X}_{i_{j-1}})(X_{i_j} - \tilde{X}_{i_j})(X_{i_{j+1}} X_{i_p}|) \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E}(|(\tilde{X}_{i_1} \dots \tilde{X}_{i_{p-1}})(X_{i_p} - \tilde{X}_{i_p})|).
\end{aligned} \tag{A.3}$$

Using the Hölder inequality and (A.2) we get a bound for the first summand on the right hand-side of (A.3)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}(|(X_{i_1} - \tilde{X}_{i_1})(X_{i_2} \dots X_{i_p})|) \\
&\quad \leq \left[\mathbb{E}\left(|(X_{i_1} - \tilde{X}_{i_1})|^{\frac{a}{a-p+1}} \right) \right]^{\frac{a-p+1}{a}} \left[\mathbb{E}\left(|X_{i_2}|^a \right) \right]^{\frac{1}{a}} \cdots \left[\mathbb{E}\left(|X_{i_p}|^a \right) \right]^{\frac{1}{a}} \\
&\quad \leq C_3(a_{\lfloor m/3 \rfloor} + \beta_{\lfloor m/3 \rfloor}^{\frac{a-p}{a-p+1}})^{\frac{a-p+1}{a}}.
\end{aligned}$$

One gets the same bound for the other summands in (A.3) which results in

$$\mathbb{E}(|X_{i_1} \dots X_{i_p} - \tilde{X}_{i_1} \dots \tilde{X}_{i_p}|) \leq C_4 a_{\lfloor m/3 \rfloor}^{\frac{a-p+1}{a}} + C_5 \beta_{\lfloor m/3 \rfloor}^{\frac{a-p}{a}}. \tag{A.4}$$

Analogously one gets

$$\mathbb{E}(|X_{i_1} \dots X_{i_k} - \tilde{X}_{i_1} \dots \tilde{X}_{i_k}|) \leq C_6 a_{\lfloor m/3 \rfloor}^{\frac{a-k+1}{a}} + C_7 \beta_{\lfloor m/3 \rfloor}^{\frac{a-k}{a}} \tag{A.5}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}(|X_{i_1} \dots X_{i_k} - \tilde{X}_{i_1} \dots \tilde{X}_{i_k}|) \leq C_8 a_{\lfloor m/3 \rfloor}^{\frac{a-p+k+1}{a}} + C_9 \beta_{\lfloor m/3 \rfloor}^{\frac{a-p+k}{a}} \tag{A.6}$$

Finally we prove the covariance inequality. Denote $A = X_{i_1} \dots X_{i_j}$, $B = X_{i_{j+1}} \dots X_{i_p}$, $\tilde{A} = \tilde{X}_{i_1} \dots \tilde{X}_{i_j}$ and $\tilde{B} = \tilde{X}_{i_{j+1}} \dots \tilde{X}_{i_p}$ then we get by (A.4), (A.5) and (A.6)

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathbb{E}(AB) - \mathbb{E}(A)\mathbb{E}(B)| &= |\mathbb{E}(AB) - \mathbb{E}(A - \tilde{A} + \tilde{A})\mathbb{E}(B - \tilde{B} + \tilde{B})| \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}(|AB - \tilde{A}\tilde{B}|) + \mathbb{E}(|\tilde{A}|)\mathbb{E}(|B - \tilde{B}|) \\
&+ \mathbb{E}(|\tilde{B}|)\mathbb{E}(|A - \tilde{A}|) + \mathbb{E}(|A - \tilde{A}|)\mathbb{E}(|B - \tilde{B}|) \\
&\leq C_6 a_{\lfloor m/3 \rfloor}^{\frac{a-p+1}{a}} + C_7 \beta_{\lfloor m/3 \rfloor}^{\frac{a-p}{a}}
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. □

The result is a little sharper if the process is bounded.

Proposition 3. *Let $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}$ be stationary and P-NED on an absolutely regular process $(Z_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ with approximation constants $(a_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$, functionals $(f_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$, error function Φ and absolutely regularity coefficients $(\beta_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$. Furthermore there exists D such that $|X_1| \leq D$ a.s. and $\int_0^\infty x\Phi(x)dx < \infty$, then there exists D_1 independent of m such that*

$$|\mathbb{E}(X_{i_1} \dots X_{i_k} X_{i_{k+1}} \dots X_{i_p}) - \mathbb{E}(X_{i_1} \dots X_{i_k})\mathbb{E}(X_{i_{k+1}} \dots X_{i_p})| \leq D_1(a_{\lfloor m/3 \rfloor} + \beta_{\lfloor m/3 \rfloor}).$$

The proof is analogous to that of proposition 2. But instead of using the Hölder inequality one uses the boundedness of X_i, which enables us to extract the largest possible absolute value D out of the expectation.

The next proposition is a Marcinkiewicz-Zygmund type inequality which bounds the $p-$th moment of the sum of the process.

Proposition 4. *Let $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}$ be stationary and P-NED on an absolutely regular process $(Z_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ with approximation constants $(a_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$, functionals $(f_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$, error function Φ and regularity coefficients $(\beta_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$. Furthermore there exists $a > p$ such that $\mathbb{E}(|X_1|^a) < \infty$, $\int_0^\infty x^{\frac{a}{a-p+1}}\Phi(x)dx < \infty$ and $\sum_{i=1}^\infty a_i^{\frac{a-p+1}{a}} i^{p-1}$ as well as $\sum_{i=1}^\infty \beta_i^{\frac{a-p}{a}} i^{p-1} < \infty$, then there exist G_1 and G_2 which may depend on p but are independent of T such that*

$$|\mathbb{E}(\sum_{i=1}^N X_i)^p| \leq G_1(T|\mathbb{E}(X_1)|)^p + G_2 T^{\lfloor p/2 \rfloor}. \tag{A.7}$$

Proof of Proposition 4. First notice that

$$|\mathbb{E}(\sum_{i=1}^T X_i)^p| \leq \sum_{i_1,\dots,i_p=1}^T |\mathbb{E}X_{i_1} \dots X_{i_p}|. \tag{A.8}$$

We actually show the result by induction applied to the right hand side of (A.8). For $p = 1$ the right hand side of (A.8) is obviously bounded by the right hand side of (A.7) setting $G_1 = 1$ and G_2=0. For the induction step $p \to p + 1$ we want to split the expectations where the time difference is largest. Ordering of time indices yields

$$\sum_{i_1,\dots,i_{p+1}=1}^T |\mathbb{E}(X_{i_1} \dots X_{i_{p+1}})| = \sum_{1\leq i_1 \leq \dots \leq i_{p+1}}^T |\mathbb{E}(X_{i_1} \dots X_{i_{p+1}})\gamma(i_1, \dots, i_{p+1})| \tag{A.9}$$

where $\gamma(i_1, \dots, i_{p+1})$ denotes the number of possible permutations which is smaller or equal $(p + 1)!$. Let $j_s = i_s - i_{s-1}$, $s = 2, \dots, p + 1$ and $j_1 = i_1$, then (A.9) is bounded by

$$(p + 1)! \sum_{j_1,\dots,j_{p+1}\geq 0}^T \sum_{j_1+\dots+j_{p+1}\leq T} |\mathbb{E}(X_{j_1} X_{j_1+j_2} \dots X_{j_1+\dots+j_{p+1}})|. \tag{A.10}$$

We divide the sum (A.10) into $A_1, \dots, A_p$ where A_s contains all $\mathbb{E}(X_{j_1} X_{j_1+j_2} \dots X_{j_1+\dots+j_{p+1}})$ where j_{s+1} is the maximum of $j_2, \dots, j_{p+1}$ and denote I_s the related index set. If j_{s+1} is maximal the other indices can only assume the values $0, \dots, j_{s+1}$ resulting in less than $(p+1)!T(j_{s+1}+1)^{p-1}$ summands for fixed j_{s+1}. By Proposition 2 one gets

$$
\begin{aligned}
|A_s| &= (p+1)! \sum_{i_1,\dots,i_{p+1} \in I_s} |\mathbb{E}(X_{i_1} \dots X_{i_{p+1}})| \\
&\leq (p+1)! \sum_{i_1,\dots,i_{p+1} \in I_s} |\mathbb{E}(X_{i_1} \dots X_{i_{s-1}}) \mathbb{E}(X_{i_s} \dots X_{i_{p+1}})| \qquad \text{(A.11)} \\
&+ (p+1)! T \sum_{j_s=1}^{T} \left(D_1 a_{\lfloor j_s/3 \rfloor}^{\frac{a-p+1}{a}} + D_2 \beta_{\lfloor j_s/3 \rfloor}^{\frac{a-p}{p}} \right) (j_s+1)^{p-1}. \qquad \text{(A.12)}
\end{aligned}
$$

The sum (A.12) is $O(T)$ by Assumption 1 ii) a). We use the induction hypothesis for (A.11) to obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
&(p+1)! \sum_{i_1,\dots,i_{s-1}=1}^{T} |\mathbb{E}(X_{i_1} \dots X_{i_{s-1}})| \sum_{i_s,\dots,i_{p+1}=1}^{T} |\mathbb{E}(X_{i_s} \dots X_{i_{p+1}})| \\
&\quad \leq (p+1)! (G_1 T^{s-1} |\mathbb{E}(X_1)|^{s-1} + G_2 T^{\lfloor \frac{s-1}{2} \rfloor}) (G_1 T^{p+2-s} |\mathbb{E}(X_1)|^{p+2-s} + G_2 T^{\lfloor \frac{p+2-s}{2} \rfloor}) \\
&\quad \leq (p+1)! \Big(G_1^2 T^{p+1} |\mathbb{E}(X_1)|^{p+1} + G_2^2 T^{\lfloor \frac{p+1}{2} \rfloor} \\
&\quad + G_1 G_2 T^{\lfloor \frac{p+2-s}{2} \rfloor} T^{s-1} |\mathbb{E}(X_1)|^{s-1} + G_1 G_2 T^{\lfloor \frac{s-1}{2} \rfloor} T^{p+2-s} |\mathbb{E}(X_1)|^{p+2-s} \Big) \\
&\quad \leq \tilde{G}_1 T^{p+1} |\mathbb{E}(X_1)|^{p+1} + \tilde{G}_2 T^{\lfloor \frac{p+1}{2} \rfloor}
\end{aligned}
$$

which completes the proof. □

There is also a version for bounded processes.

Proposition 5. *Let $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}$ be stationary and P-NED on an absolutely regular process $(Z_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ with approximation constants $(a_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$, functionals $(f_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$, error function Φ and absolutely regularity coefficients $(\beta_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$. Furthermore there exists $D \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $|X_1| < D$ a.s., $\int_0^\infty x\Phi(x)dx < \infty$ and $\sum_{i=1}^\infty a_i i^{p-1}$ as well as $\sum_{i=1}^\infty \beta_i i^{p-1} < \infty$, then there exist G_1 and G_2 which may depend on p but are independent of T such that*

$$
|\mathbb{E}(\sum_{i=1}^{N} X_i)^p| \leq G_1 (T|\mathbb{E}(X_1)|)^p + G_2 T^{\lfloor p/2 \rfloor}. \qquad \text{(A.13)}
$$

The proof is completely analogous to that of Proposition 4 using Proposition 3 instead of Proposition 2.

The proof of Theorem 1 consists of four steps

1. the mean function of $(W_{N,T}(x))_{x\in[0,1]}$ converges to that of $(\Gamma(x))_{x\in[0,1]}$,
2. the covariance function of $(W_{N,T}(x))_{x\in[0,1]}$ converges to that of $(\Gamma(x))_{x\in[0,1]}$,
3. all finite dimensional distributions of $(W_{N,T}(x))_{x\in[0,1]}$ converge against a multivariate normal distribution,
4. $(W_{N,T}(x))_{x\in[0,1]}$ is tight.

Let without loss of generality $\mathbb{E}(Y_{i,1}) = 0$ and denote $\gamma_i(h) = \mathbb{E}(Y_{i,t}Y_{i,t+h})$ the autocovariance of lag $h \in \mathbb{N}$. Furthermore we want to concentrate on the bounded case $|\Psi_i(\epsilon_{i,1}| < c_1,\ i = 1\ldots, N$. The proof in the other unbounded is completely analogous. However, the covariance inequalities then also depend on a, making calculations a little more extensive and harder to understand.

Proof of Proposition 1 step 1. First we look at one individual i. Let $x,\ 0 < x < 1$ be arbitrary and $k = \lfloor Tx \rfloor$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}((S_T^{(i)}(x))^2) &= \frac{1}{Tv_i^2}\mathbb{E}\left(\left(\frac{T-k}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{k} Y_{i,t} - \frac{k}{T}\sum_{t=k+1}^{T} Y_{i,t}\right)^2\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{Tv_i^2}\left(\frac{T-k}{T}\right)^2 \underbrace{\mathbb{E}\left(\left(\sum_{t=1}^{k} Y_{i,t}\right)^2\right)}_{A1} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{Tv_i^2}2\frac{(T-k)k}{T^2}\underbrace{\mathbb{E}\left(\left(\sum_{t=1}^{k} Y_{i,t}\right)\left(\sum_{t=k+1}^{T} Y_{i,t}\right)\right)}_{A_2} + \frac{1}{Tv_i^2}\frac{k^2}{T^2}\underbrace{\mathbb{E}\left(\left(\sum_{t=k+1}^{T} Y_{i,t}\right)^2\right)}_{A3}.\end{aligned}$$

Elementary calculations give

$$\begin{aligned}A_1 &= kv_i^2 - 2k\sum_{h=k}^{\infty}\gamma_i(h) - 2\sum_{h=1}^{k-1} h\gamma_i(h) \\ A_2 &= \sum_{h=1}^{T}\gamma_i(h)\min(h, k, T-k, T-h) \\ A_3 &= (T-k)v_i^2 - 2(T-k)\sum_{h=T-k}^{\infty}\gamma_i(h) - 2\sum_{h=1}^{T-k-1} h\gamma_i(h).\end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(W_{N,T}(x)) = \frac{\sqrt{N}}{T}\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\Bigg(&\frac{1}{v_i^2}\left(\frac{T-k}{T}\right)^2\left(-2k\sum_{h=k}^{\infty}\gamma_i(h) - 2\sum_{h=1}^{k-1}h\gamma_i(h)\right) \\ &+ \frac{1}{v_i^2}\frac{(T-k)k}{T^2}\sum_{h=1}^{T}\gamma_i(h)\min(h,k,T-k,T-h) \\ &+\frac{1}{v_i^2}\frac{k^2}{T^2}\left(-2(T-k)\sum_{h=T-k}^{\infty}\gamma_i(h) - 2\sum_{h=1}^{T-k-1}h\gamma_i(h)\right)\Bigg)\end{aligned}$$

Using Assumption 1 ii) a) and Assumption iii) of Theorem 1 we get:

$$|\mathbb{E}(W_{N,T}(x))| \le \frac{\sqrt{N}}{T}\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\frac{1}{\delta^2}\left(5\underbrace{\sum_{h=1}^{\infty}hc(1+h)^b}_{B_1} + 2\underbrace{k\sum_{h=k}^{\infty}c(1+h)^b}_{B_2} + 2\underbrace{(T-k)\sum_{h=T-k}^{\infty}c(1+h)^b}_{B_3}\right).$$

Using the integral criteria and partial integration one gets:

$$B_1 \le \int_0^{\infty} hc(1+h)^b dh = \frac{c}{(b+1)(b+2)}.$$

For B_2 one gets

$$B_2 \leq k \int_{k-1}^{\infty} c(1+h)^b dh = -\frac{c}{b+1} k^{b+2} \leq -\frac{c}{b+1}$$

and B_3 can be treated analogously. Using Assumption i) of Theorem 1 results in $|\mathbb{E}(W_{N,T}(x))| \to 0$ which gives the desired mean structure. □

Proof of Theorem 1 step 2. Calculating the covariance structure is more tedious. Let $k = [xn] > [yn] = j$, first we use the decomposition:

$$\begin{aligned}
&E([S^{(i)}(x)]^2[S^{(i)}(y)]^2) \\
&= \frac{1}{T^2 v_i^4}\mathbb{E}\left(\left[\frac{T-k}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{k} Y_{i,t} - \frac{k}{T}\sum_{t=k+1}^{T} Y_{i,t}\right]^2 \left[\frac{T-j}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{j} Y_{i,t} - \frac{j}{T}\sum_{t=j+1}^{T} Y_{i,t}\right]^2\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{T^2 v_i^4}\mathbb{E}\left(\left[\frac{(T-k)^2}{T^2}\sum_{s,t=1}^{k} Y_{i,s}Y_{i,t} - 2\frac{(T-k)k}{T^2}\sum_{s=1,t=k+1}^{k,T} Y_{i,s}Y_{i,t} + \frac{k^2}{T^2}\sum_{s,t=k+1}^{T} Y_{i,s}Y_{i,t}\right]\right. \\
&\left.\cdot\left[\frac{(T-j)^2}{T^2}\sum_{s,t=1}^{j} Y_{i,s}Y_{i,t} - 2\frac{(T-j)j}{T^2}\sum_{s=1,t=j+1}^{j,T} Y_{i,s}Y_{i,t} + \frac{j^2}{T^2}\sum_{s,t=j+1}^{T} Y_{i,s}Y_{i,t}\right]\right) \\
&= \frac{(T-k)^2(T-j)^2}{T^6 v_i^4}\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{s,t,u,v=1}^{k,k,j,j} Y_{i,t}Y_{i,s}Y_{i,u}Y_{i,v}\right) \\
&- 2\frac{(T-k)^2(T-j)j}{T^6 v_i^4}\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{s,t,u=1,v=j+1}^{k,k,j,T} Y_{i,s}Y_{i,t}Y_{i,u}Y_{i,v}\right) \\
&+ \frac{(T-k)^2 j^2}{T^6 v_i^4}\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{s,t=1,u,v=j+1}^{k,k,T,T} Y_{i,s}Y_{i,t}Y_{i,u}Y_{i,v}\right) \\
&- 2\frac{(T-k)k(T-j)^2}{T^6 v_i^4}\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{s=1,t=k+1,u,v=1}^{k,T,j,j} Y_{i,s}Y_{i,t}Y_{i,u}Y_{i,v}\right) \\
&+ 4\frac{(T-k)k(T-j)j}{T^6 v_i^4}\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{s=1,t=k+1,u=1,v=j+1}^{k,T,j,T} Y_{i,s}Y_{i,t}Y_{i,u}Y_{i,v}\right) \\
&- 2\frac{(T-k)kj^2}{T^6 v_i^4}\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{s=1,t=k+1,u,v=j+1}^{k,T,T,T} Y_{i,s}Y_{i,t}Y_{i,u}Y_{i,v}\right) \\
&+ \frac{k^2(T-j)^2}{T^6 v_i^4}\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{s,t=k+1,u,v=1}^{T,T,j,j} Y_{i,s}Y_{i,t}Y_{i,u}Y_{i,v}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&- 2\frac{k^2(T-j)j}{T^6 v_i^4}\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{s,t=k+1,u=1,v=j+1}^{T,T,j,T} Y_{i,s}Y_{i,t}Y_{i,u}Y_{i,v}\right)\\
&+ \frac{k^2 j^2}{T^6 v_i^4}\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{s,t=k+1,u,v=j+1}^{T,T,T,T} Y_{i,s}Y_{i,t}Y_{i,u}Y_{i,v}\right)\\
&= A_{i,1} + A_{i,2} + A_{i,3} + A_{i,4} + A_{i,5} + A_{i,6} + A_{i,7} + A_{i,8} + A_{i,9}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Exemplarily we look at $A_{i,9}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
A_{i,9} &= \frac{(T-k)^2(T-j)^2}{T^6 v_i^4}\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{s,t,u,v=1}^{k,k,k,k} Y_{i,t}Y_{i,s}Y_{i,u}Y_{i,v}\right)\\
&\quad + \frac{(T-k)^2(T-j)^2}{T^6 v_i^4}\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{s,t=1,u,v=k+1}^{k,k,T,T} Y_{i,t}Y_{i,s}Y_{i,u}Y_{i,v}\right)\\
&= B_{i,1} + B_{i,2}.
\end{aligned}
$$

First we look at $B_{1,i}$. Ordering such that $t \le s \le u \le v$ and substituting $s-t=l,\ u-t=m,\ v-u=n$ yields

$$
B_{1,i} = \frac{(T-k)^2(T-j)^2}{T^6 v_i^4}\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t+l+m+n\le k} Y_{i,t}Y_{i,s+t}Y_{i,m+s}Y_{i,n+m}a(l,m,n)\right)
$$

where $a(l,m,n)$ equals the number of permutations of $Y_{i,t}Y_{i,s+t}Y_{i,m+s}Y_{i,n+m}$. Now we want to apply Proposition 3 and split the expectations where the lag difference between the random variables is largest:

$$
\begin{aligned}
B_{1,i} &= \frac{(T-k)^2(T-j)^2}{T^6 v_i^4}\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t+l+m+n\le k,\ m,n<l} Y_{i,t}Y_{i,t+s}Y_{i,s+m}Y_{i,m+n}a(l,m,n)\right)\\
&\quad + \frac{(T-k)^2(T-j)^2}{T^6 v_i^4}\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{s+l+m+n\le k,\ l,m\le n} Y_{i,t}Y_{i,t+s}Y_{i,s+m}Y_{i,m+n}a(l,m,n)\right)\\
&\quad + \frac{(T-k)^2(T-j)^2}{T^6 v_i^4}\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{s+l+m+n\le k,\ l,n<m} Y_{i,t}Y_{i,t+s}Y_{i,s+m}Y_{i,m+n}a(l,m,n)\right)\\
&= \frac{(T-k)^2(T-j)^2}{T^6 v_i^4}\left(\sum_{t+s+m+n\le k,\ m,n<s} \mathbb{E}(Y_{i,t})\mathbb{E}(Y_{i,t+s}Y_{i,s+m}Y_{i,m+n})a(l,m,n) + R_{1,i}\right)\\
&\quad + \frac{(T-k)^2(T-j)^2}{T^6 v_i^4}\left(\sum_{t+s+m+n\le k,\ s,n\le m} \mathbb{E}(Y_{i,t}Y_{i,t+s})\mathbb{E}(Y_{i,s+m}Y_{i,m+n})a(l,m,n) + R_{2,i}\right)\\
&\quad + \frac{(T-k)^2(T-j)^2}{T^6 v_i^4}\left(\sum_{t+s+m+n\le k,\ s,m<n} \mathbb{E}(Y_{i,t}Y_{i,t+s}Y_{i,s+m})\mathbb{E}(Y_{i,m+n})a(l,m,n) + R_{3,i}\right)\\
&= \frac{(T-k)^2(T-j)^2}{T^6 v_i^4}\left(R_{1,i} + R_{2,i} + R_{3,i}\right)\\
&\quad + \frac{(T-k)^2(T-j)^2}{T^6 v_i^4}\left(\sum_{t+s+m+n\le k,\ s,n\le m} \mathbb{E}(Y_{i,t}Y_{i,t+s})\mathbb{E}(Y_{i,s+m}Y_{i,m+n})a(l,m,n)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
|R_{1,i}+R_{2,i}+R_{3,i}| &\le 3\frac{(T-k)^2(T-j)^2}{T^6 v_i^4}24 \sum_{t+s+m+n\le k,\ m,n<s} c(1+s)^b \\
&\le 72k\frac{(T-k)^2(T-j)^2}{T^6 v_i^4}\sum_{s=0}^{\infty} s^2 c(1+s)^b \\
&\le 72k\frac{(T-k)^2(T-j)^2}{T^6 v_i^4}\int_0^{\infty} s^2 c(1+s)^b ds \\
&\le 72k\frac{(T-k)^2(T-j)^2}{T^6 v_i^4}\frac{2c}{(b+3)(b+2)(-b-1)}
\end{aligned}
$$

and therefore

$$
\sup_{i=1,\dots,N} |R_{1,i}+R_{2,i}+R_{3,i}| \to 0.
$$

Furthermore one has

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{t+s+m+n\le k,\ s,n\le m} \mathbb{E}(Y_{i,t}Y_{i,t+s})\mathbb{E}(Y_{i,s+m}Y_{i,m+n})a(l,m,n) \\
&= \sum_{m=0}^{k}\sum_{n=0}^{k} 3 \sum_{o=1}^{k-m-n-\min(m,n)} (k-m-n-\min(m,n)-o)\gamma_i(m)\gamma_i(n)b(m,n) \\
&= 3\sum_{m=0}^{k}\sum_{n=0}^{k}(k-m-n-\min(m,n))(k-m-n-\min(m,n)-1)\gamma_i(m)\gamma_i(n)b(m,n) \\
&= 3k^2v_i^4 + 3U_i
\end{aligned}
$$

with $b(i,j) = \begin{cases} 1 & i,j=0 \\ 2 \quad \text{for} & (i,j)=(0,1)\wedge(1,0) \\ 4 & i,j>0 \end{cases}$
and the error U_i is bounded by

$$
\begin{aligned}
|U_i| &\le 8k^2\Big|\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}\sum_{n=k+1}^{\infty}\gamma_i(m)\gamma_i(n)\Big| \\
&\quad + 4\Big|\sum_{m=0}^{k}\sum_{n=0}^{k}(m+n+\min(m,n))(m+n+\min(m,n)+1)\gamma_i(m)\gamma_i(n)\Big| \\
&\le 8k^2\Big|\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}\sum_{n=k+1}^{\infty}\gamma_i(m)\gamma_i(n)\Big| + 64\Big|\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} m^2\gamma_i(m)\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} n^2\gamma_i(n)\Big| \\
&\le 8v_i^2k^2\int_{k-1}^{\infty} c(1+s)^b ds + 64\left(\int_0^{\infty} c(1+s)^b ds\right)^2 \\
&= -8v_i^2 c\frac{k^{b+3}}{b+1} + 64\left(\frac{c}{b+1}\right)^2.
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore we get

$$
\sup_{i=1,\dots,N}\frac{(T-k)^2(T-j)^2}{T^6 v_i^4}|U_i| \to 0
$$

and the non vanishing part of $B_{1,i}$ equals

$$\frac{3(T-k)^2(T-j)^2k^2}{T^6}.$$

Analogous calculations give

$$\begin{aligned}
B_{2,i} &= \frac{(T-k)^2(T-j)^2k(j-k)}{T^6} + R_{i,4} \\
A_{i,2} &= R_{i,5} \\
A_{i,3} &= \frac{(T-k)^2j^2k(T-j)}{T^6} + R_{i,6} \\
A_{i,4} &= -2\frac{(T-k)k(T-j)^2 2k(j-k)}{T^6} + R_{i,7} \\
A_{i,5} &= 4\frac{(T-k)k(T-j)jk(T-j)}{T^6} + R_{i,8} \\
A_{i,6} &= R_{i,9} \\
A_{i,7} &= \frac{k^2(T-j)^2((T-j)(j-k)+k(j-k)+(T-j)k+3(j-k)^2)}{T^6} + R_{i,10} \\
A_{i,8} &= -2\frac{k^2(T-j)j2(T-j)(j-k)}{T^6} + R_{i,11} \\
A_{i,9} &= \frac{k^2j^2(3(T-j)^2+(T-j)(j-k))}{T^6} + R_{i,12}
\end{aligned}$$

with

$$\sup_{i\in 1,\ldots,N}\sum_{k=4}^{12}|R_{i,k}| \to 0.$$

Term manipulation yields the desired covariance structure. □

Proof of Proposition 1 step 3. We show convergence of finite dimensional distributions. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x_1, \ldots, x_k$ be arbitrary, by the Cramer Wold device it is sufficient (and necessary) to show convergence of linear combinations for arbitrary $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_k$. By change of summation we get

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k}\lambda_j W_{N,T}(x_j) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\underbrace{\sum_{j=1}^{k}\lambda_j\left(\left(S_T^{(i)}(x_j)\right)^2 - \frac{\lfloor x_jT\rfloor(T-\lfloor x_jT\rfloor)}{T^2}\right)}_{D_i}$$

where D_i are independent but not identically distributed. Since D_i also depend on T we apply a central limit theorem for random arrays of Lyapunov type (see for example Serfling (1980) p. 30) with $k = 4$. Therefore one has to show

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{k}\lambda_j(S_i^2(x_j)-\mathbb{E}(S_i^2(x_j)))\right)^4}{\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{j=1}^{k}\lambda_j\left\{S_i^2(x_j)-\mathbb{E}(S_i^2(x_j))\right\}\right]^2\right)^2} \to 0. \tag{A.14}$$

For the nominator we repeatedly apply the c_r inequality and Proposition 5 to get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{k}\lambda_j[S_i^2(x_j)-\mathbb{E}(S_i^2(x_j))]\right)^4\\
&\quad\leq 8^k\sum_{j=1}^{k}\lambda_j^4\sum_{i=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(S_i^2(x_j)-\mathbb{E}(S_i^2(x_j)))^4\\
&\quad\leq 8^{k+1}\sum_{j=1}^{k}\lambda_j^4\sum_{i=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(S_i^8(x_j))+\mathbb{E}(S_i^2(x_j))^4)\\
&\quad\leq 8^{k+2}\sum_{j=1}^{k}\lambda_j^4\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(\frac{1}{T^4}\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor x_jT\rfloor}Y_{i,t}\right]^8+\frac{1}{T^4}\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t=\lfloor x_jT\rfloor+1}^{T}Y_{i,t}\right]^8\right.\\
&\quad+\frac{1}{T^4}\left[\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor x_jT\rfloor}Y_{i,t}\right)^2\right]^4+\frac{1}{T^4}\left[\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t=\lfloor x_jT\rfloor+1}^{T}Y_{i,t}\right)^2\right]^4\Bigg)\\
&\quad\leq 8^{k+2}\sum_{j=1}^{k}\lambda_j^4N(G_2+\tilde{G}_2^4).
\end{aligned}$$

For the denominator one gets

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{k}\lambda_j(S_i^2(x_j)-\mathbb{E}(S_i^2(x_j)))\right)^2\right)^2&=\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j,l=1}^{k}\lambda_j\lambda_l\mathrm{Cov}(S_i^2(x_j),S_i^2(x_l))\right)^2\\
&=\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N}\underbrace{\sum_{j,l=1}^{k}\lambda_j,\lambda_l\gamma(x_j,x_l)}_{M}+R_i\right)^2\\
&=M^2N^2+2MN\sum_{i=1}^{N}R_i+(\sum_{i=1}^{N}R_i)^2
\end{aligned}$$

where R_i denotes the remainder fulfilling $\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\sum_{i=1}^{N}R_i\to 0$, see the second step of the proof of Theorem 1. Since γ is a positive definite covariance function, we have $M>0$ and the denominator grows of the order N^2 while the nominator only grows linearly in N, which proofs (A.14) and hence the asymptotic normality. Together with step 1 and step 2 of the proves the finite dimensional distributions of $(W_{N,T}(x))_{x\in[0,1]}$ converge against that of $(\Gamma(x))_{x\in[0,1]}$. □

Proof of Theorem 1 step 4. To prove tightness, we use the moment criteria of Billingsley (1968)

(see page 95) with $k = 4$. Using an expansion we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}([W_{N,T}(x) - W_{N,T}(y)]^4) &= \frac{1}{N^2}\mathbb{E}\left(\left[\sum_{i=1}^{N} \underbrace{S_i^2(x) - \frac{\lfloor xT\rfloor(T-\lfloor xT\rfloor)}{T^2} - S_i^2(x) + \frac{\lfloor xT\rfloor(T-\lfloor xT\rfloor)}{T^2}}_{M_i}\right]^4\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{N^2}\sum_{i\neq j\neq k\neq l}\mathbb{E}(M_i)\mathbb{E}(M_j)\mathbb{E}(M_k)\mathbb{E}(M_l) + \frac{1}{N^2}\sum_{i\neq j\neq k}\mathbb{E}(M_i)^2\mathbb{E}(M_j)\mathbb{E}(M_k) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{N^2}\sum_{i\neq j}\mathbb{E}(M_i)^3\mathbb{E}(M_j) + \frac{1}{N^2}\sum_{i\neq j}\mathbb{E}(M_i)^2\mathbb{E}(M_j)^2 + \frac{1}{N^2}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(M_i)^4.\end{aligned}$$

In the first step of the proof of Theorem 1 it was shown that

$$|\mathbb{E}(M_i)| \leq \left|\mathbb{E}\left(S_i^2(x) - \frac{\lfloor xT\rfloor(T-\lfloor xT\rfloor)}{T^2}\right)\right| + \left|\mathbb{E}\left(S_i^2(y) + \frac{\lfloor yT\rfloor(T-\lfloor yT\rfloor)}{T^2}\right)\right| \leq \frac{K_1}{T},$$

where K_1 is independent of $i,\ x$ and y. Let $\lfloor Tx\rfloor = u < \lfloor Ty\rfloor = v$. For $\mathbb{E}(M_i^2)$ we use the c_r and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality to get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(M_i^2) &\leq 2\mathbb{E}([S_i(x)^2 - S_i(y)^2]^2) + 2\left(\frac{\lfloor xT\rfloor(T-\lfloor xT\rfloor)}{T^2} - \frac{\lfloor yT\rfloor(T-\lfloor yT\rfloor)}{T^2}\right)^2 \\ &\leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}([S_i(x) - S_i(y)]^4)}\sqrt{8\mathbb{E}([S_i(x)]^4) + 8\mathbb{E}([S_i(y)]^4)} + 2\left(\frac{(v-u)(u-T-v)}{T^2}\right)^2.\end{aligned}$$

Using Proposition 5 one has

$$|\mathbb{E}(S_i(x)^4)| \leq \frac{2}{T^2\delta^4}\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{T-u}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{u}Y_{i,t}\right)^4 + \frac{2}{T^2\delta^4}\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{u}{T}\sum_{t=u+1}^{T}Y_{i,t}\right)^4 \leq K_2$$

where K_2 does not depend on $i,\ x$ and y either. Also by Proposition 5 and the c_r inequality we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}([S_i(x) - S_i(y)]^4) &= \frac{8}{T^2}\mathbb{E}\left(\left[\sum_{t=u+1}^{v}X_t\right]^4\right) + \frac{8(v-u)^4}{T^6}\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t=1}^{T}X_t\right)^4 \\ &\leq K_3\frac{(u-v)^2}{T^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Together we have $\mathbb{E}(M_i^2) \leq K_4\frac{v-u}{T}$ and analogously $\mathbb{E}(M_i^4) \leq K_5\frac{(v-u)^2}{T^2}$. It remains to derive a bound for $\mathbb{E}(M_i^3)$, by expansion and Jensen inequality we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathbb{E}(M_i^3)| &\leq |\mathbb{E}([S_i(x)^2 - S_j(x)^2]^4)|^{\frac{3}{4}} + 3\left|\frac{(v-u)(u-T-v)}{T^2}\mathbb{E}([S_i(x)^2 - S_j(x)^2]^2)\right| \\ &\quad + 3\left|\left(\frac{(v-u)(u-T-v)}{T^2}\right)^2\mathbb{E}([S_i(x)^2 - S_j(x)^2])\right| + \left|\left(\frac{(v-u)(u-T-v)}{T^2}\right)^3\right|.\end{aligned}$$

With the same calculations as before, we see $|\mathbb{E}(M_i^3)| \leq K_6$. Since $\sqrt{N}/T \to 0$, there is K_7 such that $\sqrt{N}/T \leq K_7$ and we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}([W_{N,T}(x) - W_{N,T}(y)]^4) &\leq \frac{1}{N^2}N^4\left(\frac{K_1}{T}\right)^4 + \frac{1}{N^2}N^3K_4\left(\frac{K_1}{T}\right)^2 + \frac{1}{N^2}N^2K_6\frac{K_1}{T} \\ &\quad + \left(K_4\frac{v-u}{T}\right)^2 + K_5\frac{(v-u)^2}{T^2} \\ &\leq K_8\frac{(v-u)^2}{T^2} \leq K_9|x-y|^2\end{aligned}$$

which proves tightness of the process. □

Proof of Theorem 2. We assume that $|\Psi(X_{i,t})| \leq c_1,\ i = 1, \ldots, N$, though the proof is completely analogous in the other case. We first show that $\hat{v}_i$ is near to v_i in L_2 norm. Equations for variance and bias of $\hat{v}_i$ are already known, see for example Anderson (1971) chapters eight and nine, though these are for known location. Denote

$$\tilde{v}_i = \tilde{\gamma}_{i,0} + 2\sum_{i=0}^{b_{i,T}} \tilde{\gamma}_{i,h} k\left(\frac{h}{b_T}\right)$$

with

$$\tilde{\gamma}_i(h) = \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{N-h} \left(Y_{i,t} - \mathbb{E}(Y_{i,1})\right)\left(Y_{i,t+h} - \mathbb{E}(Y_{i,1})\right)$$

the long run variance with known location, where we assume in the following that $\mathbb{E}(Y_{i,1}) = 0,\ i = 1, \ldots, N$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{v_i}^2 &= \sum_{h=-b_T}^{b_T} \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T-h} \left(Y_{i,t} - \frac{1}{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T} Y_{i,s}\right)\left(Y_{i,t+h} - \frac{1}{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T} Y_{i,s}\right) k\left(\frac{h}{b_T}\right) \\
&= \sum_{h=-b_T}^{b_T} \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T-h} Y_{i,t}Y_{i,t+h} k\left(\frac{h}{b_T}\right) - \sum_{h=-b_T}^{b_T} \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T-h} Y_{i,t+h}\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} Y_{i,t} k\left(\frac{h}{b_T}\right) \\
&- \sum_{h=-b_T}^{b_T} \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} Y_{i,t+h}\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} Y_{i,t} k\left(\frac{h}{b_T}\right) + \sum_{h=-b_T}^{b_T} \frac{1}{T^3}\left(\sum_{t=1}^{T} Y_{i,t}\right)^2 k\left(\frac{h}{b_T}\right) \\
&= \tilde{v_i}^2 + R_1 + R_2 + R_3.
\end{aligned}$$

For the remainders R_1 we get

$$E(R_1^2) = \frac{1}{T^4}\sum_{h=-b_T}^{b_T}\sum_{k=-b_T}^{b_T}\sum_{r=1}^{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T-h}\sum_{u=1}^{T-k} Y_{i,r}Y_{i,s}Y_{i,t}Y_{i,u} k\left(\frac{h}{b_T}\right) k\left(\frac{k}{b_T}\right).$$

Following the calculations of step 2 of the Proof of Theorem 1 we obtain

$$E(R_1^2) \leq \frac{1}{T^4}\sum_{h=-b_T}^{b_T}\sum_{k=-b_T}^{b_T} (T^2 v_i^2 + C_1) k\left(\frac{h}{b_T}\right) k\left(\frac{k}{b_T}\right) \leq C_2 \frac{b_T^2}{T^2}$$

where C_1 as well as C_2 are independent of i, N and T. Obviously one gets the same upper bound for $E(R_2^2)$ and for the last summand with Proposition 5

$$E(R_3^2) \leq \frac{1}{T^6}\sum_{h=-b_T}^{b_T}\sum_{k=-b_T}^{b_T} T^2 C_3 k\left(\frac{h}{b_T}\right) k\left(\frac{k}{b_T}\right) \leq \frac{b_T^2}{T^4} C_4.$$

Therefore we get

$$\mathbb{E}\left([\hat{v}_i^2 - \tilde{v}_i^2]^2\right) \leq C_5 \frac{b_T^2}{T^2}.$$

For the bias of $\tilde{v}_i^2$ we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
|E(\tilde{v}_i^2) - v_i^2| &= \left| E\left(\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} Y_{i,t}^2 + 2\frac{1}{T}\sum_{h=1}^{b_T}\sum_{t=1}^{T-h} Y_{i,t}Y_{i,t+h}k\left(\frac{h}{b_T}\right)\right) - \sum_{h=-\infty}^{\infty}\gamma_i(h)\right| \\
&\leq \left| 2\sum_{h=1}^{b_T}\left(\left(1-\frac{h}{T}\right)k\left(\frac{h}{b_T}\right)-1\right)\gamma_i(h)\right| + 2\left|\sum_{h=b_T+1}^{\infty}\gamma_i(h)\right| \\
&\leq 2\left|\sum_{h=1}^{b_T}\left(1-k\left(\frac{h}{b_T}\right)\right)\gamma_i(h)\right| + 2\left|\sum_{h=1}^{b_T}\gamma_i(h)k\left(\frac{h}{b_T}\right)\frac{h}{T}\right| + 2\left|\sum_{h=b_T+1}^{\infty}\gamma_i(h)\right| \\
&= A_1 + A_2 + A_3.
\end{aligned}$$

Using Assumption 2 ii) and iii) as well as Proposition 3 one gets by an Taylor expansion for A_1

$$\begin{aligned}
|A_1| &\leq \sum_{h=1}^{b_T} c(1+h)^b C_6\left(\frac{h}{b_T}\right)^m \\
&\leq \frac{1}{b_T^m}C_7\sum_{h=1}^{\infty}(1+h)^{b+m} = \frac{1}{b_T^m}C_8.
\end{aligned}$$

By similar arguments we see

$$|A_2| \leq \frac{C_9}{T} \text{ and } |A_3| \leq C_{10}b_T^{b+1}.$$

For the variance the following expansion is known (see for example Anderson (1971), page 528, chapter 9.3.3)

$$\begin{aligned}
Var(\tilde{v}_i) &= \frac{1}{T}\sum_{g,h=-b_T}^{b_T} k\left(\frac{h}{b_T}\right)k\left(\frac{g}{b_T}\right)\sum_{r=-T+1}^{T-1}\phi(r,g,h) \\
&\quad \cdot(\gamma_i(r)\gamma_i(r+h-g) + \gamma_i(r-g)\gamma_i(r+g) + \kappa_i(h,-r,g-r)) \\
&= B_1 + B_2 + B_3
\end{aligned}$$

where $\kappa_i(r,s,t) = \mathbb{E}(Y_{i,1}Y_{i,r+1}Y_{i,s+1}, Y_{i,t+1})$ and the formal definition of $\phi(r,g,h)$ can be found on page 528 of Anderson (1971). For us it is only important that $|\phi(r,g,h)| \leq 1$. B_2 is bounded by

$$|B_2| \leq \frac{b_T}{T}\sum_{u,v=-b_T}^{b_T}|\gamma_i(u)\gamma_i(v)| + \frac{8b_T+1}{T}\sum_{u=-\infty}^{\infty}\sum_{v=b_T+1}^{\infty}|\gamma_i(u)\gamma_i(v)| \leq C_{11}\frac{b_T}{T}$$

and equivalently

$$|B_1| \leq C_{12}\frac{b_T}{T}.$$

Furthermore one has

$$\begin{aligned}
|B_3| &\leq \frac{C_{13}}{T}\sum_{r,s,t=-\infty}^{\infty}|k_i(r,s,t)| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{T}\left(\sum_{r=-\infty}^{\infty}\sum_{|s|,|t|<|r|}|k_i(r,s,t)| + \sum_{s=-\infty}^{\infty}\sum_{|r|,|t|<|s|}|k_i(r,s,t)| + \sum_{t=-\infty}^{\infty}\sum_{|r|,|s|<|t|}|k_i(r,s,t)|\right) \\
&= D_1 + D_2 + D_3.
\end{aligned}$$

One gets examplarily for D_1

$$|D_1| \leq \frac{1}{T}\sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} 4c(1+i)^b)\left(\frac{i(i+1)}{2}\right)^2 \leq \frac{C_{14}}{T}.$$

Using the results for variance and bias we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}([\hat{v}_i^2 - v_i^2]^2) &\leq 2\mathbb{E}([\hat{v}_i^2 - \tilde{v}_i^2]^2) + 2\mathbb{E}([\tilde{v}_i^2 + v_i^2]^2) \\ &\leq C_5\frac{b_T^2}{T^2} + (C_{11}+C_{12})\frac{b_T}{T} + C_{15}\frac{1}{T} + C_8\frac{1}{b_T^m} + C_{10}b_T^{b-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{A.15}$$

Now we show that the long run variance estimations $\hat{v}_i$ are bounded from below for large T, N. Denote by $D_{N,T}$ the event that $\hat{v}_i^2 > v_i^2/2,\ i = 1, \ldots, N$

$$\begin{aligned}P(D_{N,T}) &\geq 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{N} P(\hat{v}_i^2 < v_i^2/2) \\ &\geq 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{N} P(|\hat{v}_i^2 - v_i^2| \geq v_i^2/2) \\ &\geq 1 - 4\left(c_{10}\frac{b_T^2}{T^2} + c_{11}\frac{b_T}{T} + c_4\frac{1}{b_T^s} + c_6 b_T^{r\alpha-1}\right)\sum_{i=1}^{N}\frac{1}{v_i^4} \to 1.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore it is enough to prove Theorem 2 on $D_{N,T}$.
We show that the difference between $W_{N,T}(x)$ and $\tilde{W}_{N,T}(x)$ is negligible for every $x \in [0,1]$. An expansion yields

$$\begin{aligned}&W_{N,T}(x) - \tilde{W}_{N.T}(x) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(\frac{1}{\hat{v}_i^2} - \frac{1}{v_i^2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{T}\left[\sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor Tx\rfloor} Y_{i,t} - \frac{\lfloor Tx\rfloor}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} Y_{i,t}\right]^2 - v_i^2\frac{\lfloor Tx\rfloor(T-\lfloor Tx\rfloor)}{T^2}\right) \\ &+ \frac{\lfloor Tx\rfloor(T-\lfloor Tx\rfloor)}{T^2}\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\frac{v_i^2 - \hat{v}_i^2}{\hat{v_i}^2} = E_1 + E_2\end{aligned}$$

where one has for E_2

$$\mathbb{E}\left(E_2 I\{D_{N,T}\}\right)^2 \leq \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i\neq j}\frac{4}{v_i^2 v_j^2}|\mathbb{E}(\hat{v}_i^2 - v_i^2)\mathbb{E}(\hat{v}_j^2 - v_j^2)| + \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\frac{4}{v_i^4}\mathbb{E}(\hat{v}_i^2 - v_i^2)^2 \quad = F_1 + F_2$$

and furthermore

$$\begin{aligned}|F_1| &\leq \frac{1}{N\delta^4}\sum_{i\neq j}(|\mathbb{E}(\tilde{v_i}^2 - v_i^2)| + |R_1| + |R_2| + |R_3|)(|\mathbb{E}(\tilde{v_j}^2 - v_j^2)| + |R_1| + |R_2| + |R_3|) \\ &\leq \frac{N}{\delta^4}\left(\frac{C_8}{b_T^m} + \frac{C_9}{T} + C_{10}b_T^{b+1} + 2\sqrt{C_2\frac{b_T^2}{T^2}} + \sqrt{C_4\frac{b_T^2}{T^4}}\right)^2 \to 0\end{aligned}$$

as well as

$$|F_2| \leq \frac{4}{\delta^4}\left([C_5 + 2C_2]\frac{b_T^2}{T^2} + [C_{11}+C_{12}]\frac{b_T}{T} + C_{15}\frac{1}{T} + C_8\frac{1}{b_T^m} + C_{10}b_T^{b-1}\right) \to 0.$$

Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and (A.15) one gets for E_1 :

$$\mathbb{E}(|E_1|I\{D_{N,T}\}) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\frac{4}{\delta^4}\sqrt{\mathbb{E}([\hat{v_i}^2 - v_i^2]^2)}$$
$$\sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left(\left[\frac{1}{T}\left\{\sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor Tx\rfloor}Y_{i,t} - \frac{\lfloor Tx\rfloor}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}Y_{i,t}\right\}^2 - v_i^2\frac{\lfloor Tx\rfloor(T-\lfloor Tx\rfloor)}{T^2}\right]^2\right)}$$
$$\leq \sqrt{N}\sqrt{\left(C_5\frac{b_T^2}{T^2} + (C_{11}+C_{12})\frac{b_T}{T} + C_{15}\frac{1}{T} + C_8\frac{1}{b_T^m} + C_{10}b_T^{b-1}\right)\left(1+\frac{C_{16}}{T^2}\right)} \to 0$$

where C_{16} can be calculated based on step 1 and 2 of the Proof of Theorem 1. The tightness of $\tilde{W}_{N,T}(x)$ can be proved like the tightness of $W_{N,T}(x)$ using that $\hat{v_i}$ is bounded from below, which completes the proof. □

Proof of Theorem 3. Before we prove Theorem 3 notice first that Assumption 4 implies that $\mu_t^{(i)} - \mu_i$ and $\frac{1}{\sigma_t^{(i)}} - \frac{1}{\sigma_i}$ and are uniformly bounded in probability for $t \to \infty$. Denote $D_{N,T}$ the event that $|\mu_t^{(i)} - \mu_i| \leq c_1 T^{-\beta}$ and $|\frac{1}{\sigma_t^{(i)}} - \frac{1}{\sigma_i}| \leq c_1 T^{-\beta}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, N$ then

$$P(D_{N,T}) \geq 1 - 2 \cdot N c_2 T^{-\alpha} \to 1$$

therefore it is enough to prove Theorem 3 under $D_{N,T}$. W.l.o.g let $\mu_i = 0,\ \sigma_i = 1,\ i = 1, \ldots, N.$ and notice that

$$\Psi\left(\frac{X_{i,t} - \mu_T^{(i)}}{\sigma_T^{(i)}}\right) = \Psi\left(X_{i,t} - X_{i,t}\left(\frac{1}{\sigma_T^{(i)}} - 1\right) + \mu_T^{(i)}\left(\frac{1}{\sigma_T^{(i)}} - 1\right)\right). \tag{A.16}$$

Since $\mu_T^{(i)}$ and $\sigma_T^{(i)}$ can depend on $(X_{i,t})_{t=1,\ldots,T}$ it is almost impossible to work with (A.16). Since we are in the case of $D_{N,T}$ one can look at

$$\Psi\left(X_{i,t} - X_{i,t}dT^{-\beta} + eT^{-2\beta}\right) = Z_{i,T}(d,e)$$

instead, where d and e are non random with $-c_1 \leq d, e \leq c_1$. Denote

$$\bar{S}_{T,d,e}^{(i)}(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}v_i}\left(\sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor Tx\rfloor}Z_{i,t}(d,e) - \frac{\lfloor Tx\rfloor}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}Z_{i,t}(d,e)\right), \quad x \in [0,1]$$

and

$$\bar{W}_{N,T,d,e}(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(\left(\bar{S}_{T,d,e}^{(i)}(x)\right)^2 - \frac{\lfloor xT\rfloor(T-\lfloor xT\rfloor)}{T^2}\right), \quad x \in [0,1]$$

the related panel-CUSUM. We first show

$$\sup_{d,e\in[-c_1,c_1]}|W_{N,T}(x) - \bar{W}_{N,T,d,e}(x)| \to 0, \quad x \in (0,1)$$

which implies that

$$|W_{N,T}(x) - \breve{W}_{N,T}(x)| \to 0, \quad x \in (0,1)$$

where

$$\breve{W}_{N,T}(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left(\left(\breve{S}_T^{(i)}(x) \right)^2 - \frac{\lfloor xT \rfloor (T - \lfloor xT \rfloor)}{T^2} \right), \quad x \in [0,1].$$

and

$$\breve{S}_T^{(i)}(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T} v_i} \left(\sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor Tx \rfloor} \Psi \left(\frac{X_{i,t} - \mu_T^{(i)}}{\sigma_T^{(i)}} \right) - \frac{\lfloor Tx \rfloor}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \left(\frac{X_{i,t} - \mu_T^{(i)}}{\sigma_T^{(i)}} \right) \right), \quad x \in [0,1]$$

is the CUSUM statistic with estimated location and scale parameter but known long run variance v_i. The difference for one individual i equals

$$\begin{aligned}
&\bar{S}_{T,d,e}^{(i)}(x) - S^{(i)}(x) \\
&\quad = \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T} v_i} \sum_{t=1}^{k} Z_{i,T}(d,e) - \frac{k}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} Z_{i,T}(d,e) \right)^2 - \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T} v_i} \sum_{t=1}^{k} \Psi_i(X_{i,t}) - \frac{k}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \Psi(X_{i,t}) \right)^2 \\
&\quad = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T} v_i} \left(\sum_{t=1}^{k} Z_{i,T}(d,e) - \frac{k}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} Z_{i,T}(d,e) - \sum_{t=1}^{k} \Psi_i(X_{i,t}) - \frac{k}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \Psi(X_{i,t}) \right) \\
&\quad \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{T} v_i} \left(\sum_{t=1}^{k} Z_{i,T}(d,e) - \frac{k}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} Z_{i,T}(d,e) + \sum_{t=1}^{k} \Psi_i(X_{i,t}) - \frac{k}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \Psi(X_{i,t}) \right) \\
&\quad = A_i B_i.
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(B_i^2) &\leq \frac{2}{T v_i^2} \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{t=1}^{k} Z_{i,t}(d,e) - \frac{k}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} Z_{i,t}(d,e) \right)^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{2}{T v_i^2} \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{t=1}^{k} \Psi_i(X_{i,t}) - \frac{k}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \Psi(X_{i,t}) \right)^2 = D_i + E_i
\end{aligned}$$

where one has $E_i \leq 1 + \frac{c}{T}$ by the first step of the proof of Theorem 1. By a Taylor expansion of order m one gets:

$$\begin{aligned}
D_i &\leq \frac{2^{2m+3}}{T v_i^2} \mathbb{E} \left(\left[\sum_{t=1}^{k} \Psi_i(X_{i,t}) - \frac{k}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \Psi(X_{i,t}) \right]^2 \right) \\
&\quad \vdots \\
&\quad + \frac{2^{2m+3}}{T v_i^2} (dT^{-\beta})^m \mathbb{E} \left(\left[\sum_{t=1}^{k} \Psi_i^{(m)}(X_{i,t}) X_{i,t}^m - \frac{k}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \Psi^{(m)}(X_{i,t}) X_{i,t}^m \right]^2 \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{2^{2m+3}}{T v_i^2} (eT^{-2\beta})^m \mathbb{E} \left(\left[\sum_{t=1}^{k} \Psi_i^{(m)}(X_{i,t}) - \frac{k}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \Psi^{(m)}(X_{i,t}) \right]^2 \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{2^{2m+3}}{T v_i^2} (dT^{-\beta} + eT^{-2\beta})^{m+1} (k+T) c \\
&\quad \leq C_1 + C_2 (dT)^{-(m+1)\beta+1}.
\end{aligned}$$

For A_i we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(A_i^2) \leq & \frac{2^{2m+3}}{Tv_i^2} dT^{-\beta} \mathbb{E}\left(\left[\sum_{t=1}^{k} \Psi_i^{(1)}(X_{i,t}) X_{i,t} - \frac{k}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} \Psi^{(1)}(X_{i,t}) X_{i,t}\right]^2\right) \\
& + \frac{2^{2m+3}}{Tv_i^2} eT^{-2\beta} \mathbb{E}\left(\left[\sum_{t=1}^{k} \Psi_i^{(1)}(X_{i,t}) - \frac{k}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} \Psi^{(1)}(X_{i,t})\right]^2\right) \\
& \vdots \\
& + \frac{2^{2m+3}}{Tv_i^2} (dT^{-\beta})^m \mathbb{E}\left(\left[\sum_{t=1}^{k} \Psi_i^{(m)}(X_{i,t}) X_{i,t}^m - \frac{k}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} \Psi^{(m)}(X_{i,t}) X_{i,t}^m\right]^2\right) \\
& + \frac{2^{2m+3}}{Tv_i^2} (eT^{-2\beta})^m \mathbb{E}\left(\left[\sum_{t=1}^{k} \Psi_i^{(m)}(X_{i,t}) - \frac{k}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} \Psi^{(m)}(X_{i,t})\right]^2\right) \\
& + \frac{2^{2m+3}}{Tv_i^2} (dT^{-\beta} + eT^{-2\beta})^{m+1} (k+T)c \\
& \leq dC_3 T^{-\beta} + C_4 (dT)^{-(m+1)\beta+1} ..
\end{aligned}$$

Putting everything together we have

$$sup_{d,e\in[-c_1,c_1]} E(|W_{N,T}(x) - \bar{W}_{N,T,d}(x)|) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left(C_5 T^{-\beta} + C_6 T^{-(m+1)\beta+1}\right) \to 0$$

which implies pointwise convergence. To get weak convergence we need tightness of $W_{N,T}(x) - \tilde{W}_{N,T,d}(x)$. Since

$$\begin{aligned}
& W_{N,T}(x) - \bar{W}_{N,T,d}(x) \\
& \quad = \sum_{j,k=0}^{m} \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{1}{Tv_i^2} (eT^{-2\beta})^{j+k} \left(\sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor Tx \rfloor} \Psi^{(j)}(X_{i,t}) - \frac{\lfloor Tx \rfloor}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} \Psi^{(j)}(X_{i,t})\right) \\
& \quad \cdot \left(\sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor Tx \rfloor} \Psi^{(k)}(X_{i,t}) - \frac{\lfloor Tx \rfloor}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} \Psi^{(k)}(X_{i,t})\right) \\
& \quad + \sum_{j,k=0}^{m} \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{1}{Tv_i^2} (dT^{-\beta})^{j+k} \left(\sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor Tx \rfloor} \Psi^{(j)}(X_{i,t}) X_{i,t}^j - \frac{\lfloor Tx \rfloor}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} \Psi^{(j)}(X_{i,t}) X_{i,t}\right) \\
& \quad \cdot \left(\sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor Tx \rfloor} \Psi^{(k)}(X_{i,t}) X_{i,t}^k - \frac{\lfloor Tx \rfloor}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} \Psi^{(k)}(X_{i,t}) X_{i,t}^k\right) \\
& \quad + 2\sum_{j,k=0}^{m} \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{1}{Tv_i^2} (eT^{-2\beta})^{j} (dT^{-\beta})^{k} \left(\sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor Tx \rfloor} \Psi^{(j)}(X_{i,t}) - \frac{\lfloor Tx \rfloor}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} \Psi^{(j)}(X_{i,t})\right) \\
& \quad \cdot \left(\sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor Tx \rfloor} \Psi^{(k)}(X_{i,t}) X_{i,t}^k - \frac{\lfloor Tx \rfloor}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} \Psi^{(k)}(X_{i,t}) X_{i,t}^k\right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+2\sum_{j=1}^{m}\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\frac{1}{Tv_i^2}(eT^{-2\beta})^{j+m+1}\left(\sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor Tx\rfloor}\Psi^{(j)}(X_{i,t})-\frac{\lfloor Tx\rfloor}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\Psi^{(j)}(X_{i,t})\right)\\
&\left(\sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor Tx\rfloor}\Psi^{(m+1)}(\xi_{i,t})-\frac{\lfloor Tx\rfloor}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\Psi^{(m+1)}(\xi_{i,t})\right)\\
&+2\sum_{j=1}^{m}\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\frac{1}{Tv_i^2}(dT^{-\beta})^{j+m+1}\left(\sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor Tx\rfloor}\Psi^{(j)}(X_{i,t})X_{i,t}-\frac{\lfloor Tx\rfloor}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\Psi^{(j)}(X_{i,t})X_{i,t}\right)\\
&\left(\sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor Tx\rfloor}\Psi^{(m+1)}(\xi_{i,t})X_{i,t}-\frac{\lfloor Tx\rfloor}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\Psi^{(m+1)}(\xi_{i,t})X_{i,t}\right)\\
&+2\sum_{j=1}^{m}\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\frac{1}{Tv_i^2}(dT^{-\beta})^{j}(eT^{-2\beta})^{m+1}\left(\sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor Tx\rfloor}\Psi^{(j)}(X_{i,t})X_{i,t}^{j}-\frac{\lfloor Tx\rfloor}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\Psi^{(j)}(X_{i,t})X_{i,t}^{j}\right)\\
&\left(\sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor Tx\rfloor}\Psi^{(m+1)}(\xi_{i,t})-\frac{\lfloor Tx\rfloor}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\Psi^{(m+1)}(\xi_{i,t})\right)\\
&+2\sum_{j=1}^{m}\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\frac{1}{Tv_i^2}(eT^{-2\beta})^{j}+(dT^{-\beta})^{m+1}\left(\sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor Tx\rfloor}\Psi^{(j)}(X_{i,t})-\frac{\lfloor Tx\rfloor}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\Psi^{(j)}(X_{i,t})\right)\\
&\left(\sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor Tx\rfloor}\Psi^{(m+1)}(\xi_{i,t})X_{i,t}-\frac{\lfloor Tx\rfloor}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\Psi^{(m+1)}(\xi_{i,t})X_{i,t}\right)\\
&+\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\frac{1}{Tv_i^2}(eT^{-2\beta})^{2m+2}\left(\sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor Tx\rfloor}\Psi^{(m+1)}(\xi_{i,t})-\frac{\lfloor Tx\rfloor}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\Psi^{(m+1)}(\xi_{i,t})\right)^{2}\\
&+\frac{2}{\sqrt{N}}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\frac{1}{Tv_i^2}(eT^{-2\beta})^{m+1}(dT^{-\beta})^{m+1}\left(\sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor Tx\rfloor}\Psi^{(m+1)}(\xi_{i,t})-\frac{\lfloor Tx\rfloor}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\Psi(\xi_{i,t})\right)\\
&\cdot\left(\sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor Tx\rfloor}\Psi^{(m+1)}(\xi_{i,t})X_{i,t}-\frac{\lfloor Tx\rfloor}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\Psi(\xi_{i,t})X_{i,t}\right)\\
&+\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\frac{1}{Tv_i^2}(dT^{-\beta})^{2m+2}\left(\sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor Tx\rfloor}\Psi(\xi_{i,t})X_{i,t}-\frac{\lfloor Tx\rfloor}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\Psi(\xi_{i,t})X_{i,t}\right)^{2}\\
&=\sum_{j,k=0}^{m}A_{jk}(x)+2\sum_{j,k=1}^{m}B_{jk}(x)+\sum_{j,k=1}^{m}C_{jk}(x)+2\sum_{j=0}^{m}D_{j}(x)+2\sum_{j=0}^{m}E_{j}(x)\\
&+2\sum_{j=0}^{m}F_{j}(x)+2\sum_{j=0}^{m}G_{j}(x)+H(x)+2I(x)+K(x)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\xi_{i,t}\in[X_{i,t},X_{i,t}+dT^{-\beta}X_{i,t}+eT^{-2\beta}]$. It is enough to proof tightness for the individual

summands. We exemplarily look at A_{jk}. Denote

$$M_i^{(jk)} = \frac{1}{Tv_i^2}\left(\sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor Tx\rfloor}\Psi^{(j)}(X_{i,t}) - \frac{\lfloor Tx\rfloor}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\Psi^{(j)}(X_{i,t})\right)\left(\sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor Tx\rfloor}\Psi^{(k)}(X_{i,t}) - \frac{\lfloor Tx\rfloor}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\Psi^{(k)}(X_{i,t})\right)$$
$$- \frac{1}{Tv_i^2}\left(\sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor Ty\rfloor}\Psi^{(j)}(X_{i,t}) - \frac{\lfloor Ty\rfloor}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\Psi^{(j)}(X_{i,t})\right)\left(\sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor Ty\rfloor}\Psi^{(k)}(X_{i,t}) - \frac{\lfloor Ty\rfloor}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\Psi^{(k)}(X_{i,t})\right)$$

then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}(|A_{jk}(x) - A_{jk}(y)|^4)\\
&= \frac{1}{N^2}\sum_{r\neq s\neq t\neq u}\mathbb{E}(M_r^{(jk)})\mathbb{E}(M_s^{(jk)})\mathbb{E}(M_t^{(jk)})\mathbb{E}(M_u^{(jk)}) + \frac{1}{N^2}\sum_{r\neq s\neq t}\mathbb{E}((M_r)^{(jk)})^2\mathbb{E}(M_s^{(jk)})\mathbb{E}(M_t^{(jk)})\\
&+ \frac{1}{N^2}\sum_{r\neq s}\mathbb{E}(M_r^{(jk)})^3\mathbb{E}(M_s^{(jk)}) + \frac{1}{N^2}\sum_{r\neq s}\mathbb{E}(M_r^{(jk)})^2\mathbb{E}(M_s^{(jk)})^2 + \frac{1}{N^2}\sum_{i=r}^{N}\mathbb{E}(M_r^{(jk)})^4,
\end{aligned}$$

so that boundaries for $|\mathbb{E}(M_i^{(jk)})|$, $|\mathbb{E}(M_i^{(jk)})^2|$, $|\mathbb{E}(M_i^{(jk)})^3|$ and $|\mathbb{E}(M_i^{(jk)})^4|$ are needed. For the former we get

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathbb{E}(M_i^{(jk)})| = \Bigg|\frac{1}{Tv_i^2}\mathbb{E}\Bigg(&\left[\sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor Tx\rfloor}\Psi^{(j)}(X_{i,t}) - \frac{\lfloor Tx\rfloor}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\Psi^{(j)}(X_{i,t})\right]\\
&\cdot\left[\sum_{t=\lfloor Ty\rfloor+1}^{\lfloor Tx\rfloor}\Psi^{(k)}(X_{i,t}) - \frac{\lfloor Tx\rfloor - \lfloor Tx\rfloor}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\Psi^{(k)}(X_{i,t})\right]\\
&+\left[\sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor Ty\rfloor}\Psi^{(k)}(X_{i,t}) - \frac{\lfloor Ty\rfloor}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\Psi^{(k)}(X_{i,t})\right]\\
&\cdot\left[\sum_{t=\lfloor Ty\rfloor+1}^{\lfloor Tx\rfloor}\Psi^{(j)}(X_{i,t}) - \frac{\lfloor Ty\rfloor - \lfloor Ty\rfloor}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\Psi^{(j)}(X_{i,t})\right]\Bigg)\Bigg|\\
&\leq \frac{1}{\delta T}(\sqrt{4C_5\lfloor Tx\rfloor}\sqrt{4C_6(\lfloor Tx\rfloor - \lfloor Ty\rfloor)} + \sqrt{4C_6\lfloor Tx\rfloor}\sqrt{4C_5(\lfloor Tx\rfloor - \lfloor Ty\rfloor)})\\
&\leq C_7\sqrt{x-y}
\end{aligned}$$

Analogously one can prove $\mathbb{E}([M_i^{(jk)}]^2) \leq K_2C_8(x-y)$, $|\mathbb{E}(M_i^3)| \leq C_9(x-y)^{\frac{3}{2}}$ and $\mathbb{E}(M_i^4) \leq C_{10}(x-y)^2$ which proofs that A_{jk} is tight. We cannot use Proposition 5 for terms containing $\Psi(\xi_{i,t})$ since we do not have covariance inequalities in this case. Instead we can use the trivial inequality

$$\mathbb{E}(\sum_{i=1}^{T}\Psi^{(m+1)}(\xi_{i,t}))^k \leq \mathbb{E}(\sum_{i=1}^{T}|\Psi^{(m+1)}|_\infty)^k = T^k|\Psi^{(m+1)}|_\infty \tag{A.17}$$

in such cases.
It remains to show that

$$\sup_{x\in[0,1]}|\breve{W}_{N,T}(x) - \check{W}_{N,T}(x)| \to 0$$

The crucial part is to bound the difference between $\hat{v}_i$ and

$$\check{v}_i = \check{\gamma}_{i,0} + 2\sum_{i=0}^{b_{i,T}} \check{\gamma}_{i,h} k\left(\frac{h}{b_T}\right),\ i = 1, \ldots, N,$$

with

$$\check{\gamma}_i(h) = \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{N-h}\left(\Psi\left[\frac{X_{i,t}-\mu_T^{(i)}}{\sigma_T^{(i)}}\right] - \check{Y}_i\right)\left(\Psi\left[\frac{X_{i,t}-\mu_T^{(i)}}{\sigma_T^{(i)}}\right] - \check{Y}_i\right),\ h = 0, \ldots, T-1,$$

with $\check{Y}_i = \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\Psi\left(\frac{X_{i,t}-\mu_T^{(i)}}{\sigma_T^{(i)}}\right)$. By a Taylor expansion one gets

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{v}_i^2 - \check{v}_i^2 &= \frac{1}{T}\sum_{s.t=1}^{T}\left(\Psi(X_{i,t}) - \frac{1}{T}\sum_{r=1}^{T}\Psi(X_{i,r})\right)\left(\Psi(X_{i,s}) - \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\Psi(X_{i,r})\right)k\left(\frac{s-t}{b_T}\right)\\
&\quad - \frac{1}{T}\sum_{s.t=1}^{T}\left(\Psi(X_{i,t}) + M(X_{i,t}) + R(\xi_{i,t}) - \frac{1}{T}\sum_{r=1}^{T}\Psi(X_{i,r}) + M(X_{i,r}) + R(\xi_{i,r})\right)\\
&\quad \left(\Psi(X_{i,s}) + M(X_{i,s}) + R(\xi_{i,s}) - \frac{1}{T}\sum_{r=1}^{T}\Psi(X_{i,r}) + M(X_{i,r}) + R(\xi_{i,r})\right)k\left(\frac{s-t}{b_T}\right)\\
&= \frac{1}{T}\sum_{r,s=1}^{T}\big[(R_{i,t}-\overline{R}_i)(R(\xi_{i,s})-\overline{R}_i) + (M(X_{i,t})-\overline{M}_i)(M(X_{i,s})-\overline{M}_i)\\
&\quad + 2(M(X_{i,t})-\overline{M}_i)(R(\xi_{i,s})-\overline{R}_i) + 2(M(X_{i,t})-\overline{M}_i)(\Psi(X_{i,s})-\overline{\Psi}_i)\\
&\quad + 2(R(\xi_{i,t})-\overline{R}_i)(\Psi(X_{i,s})-\overline{\Psi}_i)\big]\,k\left(\frac{r-s}{b_T}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$M(X_{i,t}) = \sum_{j=0}^{m}\Psi^{(j)}(X_{i,t})(eT^{-2b} + X_{i,t}^{(j)}dT^{-\beta})$$

$\overline{M}_i = \frac{1}{T}\sum_{i=1}^{T} M(X_{i,t})$, $\overline{R}_i = \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{N} R(\xi_{i,t})$, $\overline{\Psi} = \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\Psi(X_{i,t})$ and

$$R(\xi_{i,t}) = \Psi^{(m+1)}(\xi_{i,t})([eT^{-2\beta}]^{m+1} + [dT^{-\beta}]^{m+1}X_{i,t}^{(m+1)}).$$

In the following we will derive upper bounds with respect to L_2-norm.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left(\left[\frac{1}{T}\sum_{r,s=1}^{T}(R(\xi_{i,t})-\overline{R}_i)(R(\xi_{i,t})-\overline{R}_i)k\left(\frac{r-s}{b_T}\right)\right]^2\right)\\
&\leq 8\mathbb{E}\left(\left[\frac{1}{T}\sum_{r,s=1}^{T}R(\xi_{i,t})R(\xi_{i,t})k\left(\frac{r-s}{b_T}\right)\right]^2\right) + 16\mathbb{E}\left(\left[\frac{1}{T}\sum_{r=1}^{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T}R(\xi_{i,t})\overline{R}k\left(\frac{r-s}{b_T}\right)\right]^2\right)\\
&+ \mathbb{E}\left(\left[\frac{1}{T}\sum_{r=1}^{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\overline{R}^2 k\left(\frac{r-s}{b_T}\right)\right]^2\right)\\
&\leq 8T^2(dT^{-\beta})^{4m+4}c_1^4 + 16T(dT^{-\beta})^{4m+4}c_1^4 + 8(dT^{-\beta})^{4m+4}c_1^4
\end{aligned}$$

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{T}\sum_{s,t=1}^{N}\left[\left(M_{i,t}-\overline{M}\right)\left(M_{i,s}-\overline{M}\right)\right]^2\right) \leq 2^{3m^2}\sum_{j,k}^{m}(eT^{-2\beta})^{j+k}$$
$$\mathbb{E}\left(\left[\frac{1}{T}\sum_{s,t}^{T}\left(\Psi^{(j)}(X_{i,t})-\frac{1}{T}\sum_{r=1}^{T}\Psi^{(j)}(X_{i,r})\right)\left(\Psi^{(k)}(X_{i,s})-\frac{1}{T}\sum_{r=1}^{T}\Psi^{(k)}(X_{i,r})\right)k\left(\frac{s-t}{b_T}\right)\right]^2\right)$$
$$+2^{3m^2}\sum_{j,k}^{m}(dT^{-\beta})^{j+k}\mathbb{E}\left(\left[\frac{1}{T}\sum_{s,t}^{T}\left(\Psi^{(j)}(X_{i,t})X_{i,t}^{j}-\frac{1}{T}\sum_{r=1}^{T}\Psi^{(j)}(X_{i,r})X_{i,r}^{j}\right)\right.$$
$$\left.\left(\Psi^{(k)}(X_{i,s})X_{i,s}-\frac{1}{T}\sum_{r=1}^{T}\Psi^{(k)}(X_{i,r})X_{i,r}\right)k\left(\frac{s-t}{b_T}\right)\right]^2\right)$$
$$+2^{3m^2+1}\sum_{j,k}^{m}(dT^{-\beta})^{j}+(eT^{-2\beta})^{k}\mathbb{E}\left(\left[\frac{1}{T}\sum_{s,t}^{T}\left(\Psi^{(j)}(X_{i,t})X_{i,t}^{j}-\frac{1}{T}\sum_{r=1}^{T}\Psi^{(j)}(X_{i,r})X_{i,r}^{j}\right)\right.\right.$$
$$\left.\left.\left(\Psi^{(k)}(X_{i,s})-\frac{1}{T}\sum_{r=1}^{T}\Psi^{(k)}(X_{i,r})\right)k\left(\frac{s-t}{b_T}\right)\right]^2\right)=\sum_{j,k}A_{j,k}+\sum_{j,k}B_{j,k}+\sum_{j,k}C_{j,k}.$$

Let w.l.o.g $\mathbb{E}(\Psi^{j}(X_{i,1}))=0$ $j=1,\ldots,m$, then we get exemplarily for $A_{j,k}$

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\left[\frac{1}{T}\sum_{s,t}^{T}\left(\Psi^{(j)}(X_{i,t})-\frac{1}{T}\sum_{r=1}^{T}\Psi^{(j)}(X_{i,r})\right)\left(\Psi^{(k)}(X_{i,s})-\frac{1}{T}\sum_{r=1}^{T}\Psi^{(k)}(X_{i,r})\right)k\left(\frac{s-t}{b_T}\right)\right]^2\right)$$
$$\leq 2^3\mathbb{E}\left(\left[\frac{1}{T}\sum_{s,t}^{T}\Psi^{(j)}(X_{i,t})\Psi^{(j)}(X_{i,r})k\left(\frac{s-t}{b_T}\right)\right]^2\right)$$
$$+2^4\mathbb{E}\left(\left[\frac{1}{T}\sum_{s,t}^{T}\Psi^{(j)}(X_{i,t})\frac{1}{T}\sum_{r=1}^{T}\Psi^{(j)}(X_{i,r})k\left(\frac{s-t}{b_T}\right)\right]^2\right)$$
$$+2^3\mathbb{E}\left(\left[\frac{1}{T}\left(\frac{1}{T}\sum_{r=1}^{T}\Psi^{(j)}(X_{i,r})\right)^2\sum_{s,t}^{T}\left(\frac{s-t}{b_T}\right)\right]^2\right)$$
$$\leq c_1+\frac{c_2}{T}+\frac{c_3}{T^2}$$

The other cases are analogous and we finally obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\left([\hat{v}_i^2-\check{v}_i^2]^2\right)\leq c_4T^2(dT^{-\beta})^{4m+4}+c_5(dT^{-\beta}).$$

The remaining part of the proof now is similar to the proof of Theorem 2. □